



SAN DIEGO STATE
UNIVERSITY

Georgia

SDSU-Georgia

5500 Campanile Drive
San Diego CA 92182-1324
619-594-6071
FAX: 619-594-8078

Magda Magradze
Chief Executive Officer
Millennium Challenge Account – Georgia
52 Uznadze Street
0102 Tbilisi, Georgia

8/14/2014

Dear Ms. Magradze,

Please find enclosed herewith the documents for the Inception Report for the Provision of Degree Accreditation and Institutional Support Initiative for Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics, as required per the contract dated July 28, 2014. The specific documents attached include:

- Mobilization and Business Unit Startup Status Report
- Updated Work Plan and Renovations/Construction Schedule
- Updated Five-Year Draft Budget and Work Plan
- Updated List of Academic/Laboratory Equipment for Pre-Enrollment Period
- Comparative Analysis Map of SDSU Standards and IFC Performance Standard 1
- Draft Initial Screening Tool and Condition Assessment Report
- Draft Agreement with Partner Institutions (TSU agreement supplied as reference terms for all partner institutions)

Per the terms of the agreement, please provide review comments within 10 business days. An invoice for the associated payment amount is also included.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions. I am available at +995 558 174 414 or kwalsh@mail.sdsu.edu.

Very truly yours,

Kenneth D. Walsh
Dean

Annex 1 – Mobilization and Business Unit Startup Status Report

The rest of this page is left intentionally blank.

Mobilization and Business Unit Startup Status Report

The primary purpose of the mobilization and startup is to establish and maintain the management team, program office, and administrative and operational programs and processes to achieve the objectives of the STEM Higher Education Project in accordance with the Pre-Enrollment Contract. Beginning with the preparation and submission of this Inception Report, the remaining responsibilities were focused primarily on the engagement of key personnel at SDSU, the SDSU-Georgia program office and Partner Institutions; securing professional consulting support services; overseeing the activities of Tasks 2 through 7 in collaboration with Partners; and administration of the program.

The negotiated Agreement specifying contract terms for the Pre-Enrollment period was executed in parts by MCA-Georgia and SDSU on July 28, 2014 and August 12, 2014, respectively. Execution in parts was preferred to secure original “wet” signatures on hard copies of the agreement.

In anticipation of the Pre-Enrollment contract, SDSU pursued startup preparation to ensure efficient launch of the Business unit upon execution of the contract.

1. The Dean was mobilized into Georgia on July 4, 2014. A Management Personnel Plan hire, this allowed SDSU to have more direct involvement in the negotiations leading to the final version of the Pre-Enrollment agreement. The Dean facilitated continued collaboration with the partner universities, especially drafting of required inception report agreements.
2. The business unit secured temporary operational space at Tbilisi State University, with a Dean’s office in Building 2, Room 101, and additional space available in Room 102. Permanent space will be outfitted contiguous to MCA-Georgia upon scheduled design and renovation. Completion of the permanent space is projected for January 2015.
3. Business services and human resources support services have been defined and solicited. In accordance with SDSU procurement procedures, a qualified respondent was selected. As of this writing, negotiations are underway to bring this respondent under contract.
4. Design and construction supervision services have been solicited. Qualifications statements have been received from interested parties. The Terms of Reference (TOR) for Design and Construction Supervision are being drafted for review by MCA-Georgia in accordance with the Agreement. Once an acceptable TOR document has been developed, negotiations with an appropriate qualified design and construction supervision respondent, in accordance with SDSU procurement procedures, will occur.
5. Legal counsel in Georgia has been identified and retained.
6. SDSU Research Foundation Fiscal and Project Coordination resources have been identified and brought on-line to support the project, as described in the Personnel Budget.
7. Employment Opportunity, Director Business and Financial Affairs, was posted on. As of this writing, a first round of interviews has been conducted and second round interviews are underway for this position.

8. Additional job postings will be advertised over the next few days and weeks to complete the initial staffing of the business unit. The proposed schedule for upcoming additional advertisement and hiring is shown below. Unless otherwise noted, positions indicated are to be located in Georgia. Note that positions on the SDSU campus can be filled from existing staff via appointment, and may not require separate posting.

Anticipated Date Postings Open	Positions to be Posted
Week of August 18	Accreditation and Articulation Staff Support (SDSU Campus)
Week of August 25	Administrative Assistant Construction/Renovation Manager Program Coordinator (SDSU Campus) Director, English/STEM Institute (possibly SDSU campus hire)
Week of September 1	Director, External Relations Procurement and Accounting Support Director of Information Technology Systems
Week of September 15	Director of Facilities Director of Faculty/Student Affairs Administrative Assistant Instructional Staff – English Stem Institute (Fall 2015 delivery)

9. Eleven faculty from the partner institutions visited SDSU's main campus during July and August, in visits ranging from two to five weeks. The objectives of the faculty visit program are to develop familiarity with teaching and assessment methods in the relevant SDSU programs, to develop familiarity with SDSU faculty in order to foster collaborations in teaching and research activities, and to develop familiarity with other relevant programs (such as the entrepreneurship centers and sponsored research project infrastructure). Visiting faculty worked closely with SDSU colleagues in their discipline and had many opportunities to use the laboratory equipment that will be deployed in the teaching laboratories in Georgia at the partner institutions.
10. Faculty from the partner institutions were interviewed by the Dean to support selection of those to visit SDSU during the Fall semester. A total of nine were selected, out of 28 interviewed, for visits during the Fall semester. SDSU staff are supporting the visa arrangements for the Fall cohort. A visit from roughly September 28 to December 5 is expected for this cohort, with a program that will be quite similar to that experienced by the visitors described in item 8.
11. Through a series of meetings with representatives of the partner universities and the Georgian Educational Quality Enhancement (EQE) staff, efforts are underway to complete the documents needed for the accreditation effort needed in order to place the SDSU-Georgia degree programs on the list of accredited institutions that students can select for admittance based on completion of the Georgian national exam in 2015.

This is a critical step for recruiting of students to the proposed programs. Documents will be submitted for Electrical and Computer Engineering, Computer Science, and Chemistry with a Biochemistry emphasis in 2014, for students to be able to select these majors for admission in the Fall of 2015.

Annex 2 – Updated Work Plan and Renovations/Construction Schedule

The rest of this page is left intentionally blank.



PRE-ENROLLMENT CONTRACT WORK PLAN EVENTS SCHEDULE																		
Invoices/ Reports/Tasks	Elements	Title	Jul-14	Aug-14	Sep-14	Oct-14	Nov-14	Dec-14	Jan-15	Feb-15	Mar-15	Apr-15	May-15	Jun-15	Jul-15	Aug-15	Sep-15	Oct-15
Invoices	INV 1	Invoice #1 - 18% of Award		15-Aug														
	INV 2	Invoice #2 - 17% of Award				15-Oct												
	INV 3	Invoice #3 - 20% of Award							15-Jan									
	INV 4	Invoice #4 - 20% of Award										15-Apr						
	INV 5	Invoice #5 - 12.5% of Award													15-Jul			
	INV 6	Invoice #6 - 12.5% of Award																15-Oct
Reports	IR	Inception Report		15-Aug														
	IR-1.1	Startup Report		X														
	IR-1.2	Update Work Plan		X														
	IR-1.3	Update 5-Year Budget and Plan		X														
	IR-1.4	Update Equipment List		X														
	IR-1.5	Environmental/Social Impact Analysis		X														
	IR-1.6	Draft Partner Institution Agreements		X														
Q1	Q1.1	Quarter 1 Progress Report				15-Oct												
	Q1.1	Q1 Work Plan Execution	X	X	X													
	Q1.2	English/Stem Enrollment - Target 75		X	X													
	Q1.3	Responsive Student Recruitment Plan (G/SV)		X	X													
	Q1.4	Academic Leadership Workshop	X															
	Q1.5	Draft ESMF and ESMP		X	X													
	Q1.6	Draft TORs Renovations		X	X													
	Q1.6	Draft TORs Construction		X	X													
	Q1.7	Accreditation Submissions	X	X														
	Q1.8	Articulation Plan		X	X													
	Q1.9	Signed Partner Institution Agreements			X													
	Q1.10	Update Q2 planned activities			X													
	Q1.11	Monitoring and Evaluation Plan Report			X													
	Q1.12NPD	Guidelines for GRDF Utilization			X													
Q2	Q2.1	Quarter 2 Progress Report							15-Jan									
	Q2.1	Q2 Work Plan Execution				X	X	X										
	Q2.2	Georgian Faculty Training - Target 10				X	X	X										
	Q2.3	Articulation Status - Target 6 courses				X	X	X										
	Q2.4	Renovation Bidding Documents Pkg				X	X	X										
	Q2.5	Industry Advisory Board Meeting				X												
	Q2.6	Update Q3 planned activities						X										
	Q2.7	Monitoring and Evaluation Plan Report																
	Q2.8NPD	GRDF MOU Signed and Implemented						X										
Q3	Q3.1	Quarter 3 Progress Report										15-Apr						
	Q3.1	Q3 Work Plan Execution							X	X	X							
	Q3.2	English/Stem Enrollment - Target 75							X	X	X							
	Q3.3	Georgian Faculty Training - Target 10								X	X	X						
	Q3.4	Articulation Status - Target 6 courses							X	X	X							
	Q3.5	Draft Construction Bidding Documents							X	X	X							
	Q3.6	Update Q4 planned activities									X							
	Q3.7	Monitoring and Evaluation Plan Report																
Q4	Q4.1	Quarter 4 Progress Report													15-Jul			
	Q4.1	Q4 Work Plan Execution										X	X	X				
	Q4.2	Articulation Status - Target 6 courses										X	X	X				
	Q4.3	Draft 45-month Work Plan and Budget												X				
	Q4.4	Update Q5 planned activities												X				
	Q4.5	Monitoring and Evaluation Plan Report																
Q5		Quarter 5 Progress Report																15-Oct

	Q5.1	Q5 Work Plan Execution														X	X	X			
	Q5.2	Articulation Status - Target 6 courses														X	X	X			
	Q5.3	Equipment Procurement Report																X			
	Q5.4	Final 45-month Work Plan and Budget																X			
	Q5.5	Monitoring and Evaluation Plan Report																			
	Q5.6	Summary Assessment and Lessons Learned Pre-Enrollment Final Report																X			
Tasks																					
Task 1		Business Unit Organization																			
	1.1	Inception Activities and Report		X																	
	1.2	Staffing Plan																			
		Dean and startup	H-4	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			
		Directors/Support Staff		H-7	X	H-5	X	X	H-1	X	X	H-2	X	X	X	X	X	X			
	1.3	Contract Signing and Kick-off Event	X																		
	1.4	Consulting/Services Agreements																			
		Business/Human Resources Services		C	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			
		Legal/Import-Export Services		C	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			
		Design Services & Management		C	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			
	1.5	GE Staff Indoctrination and Training at SDSU		3		3							1				4				
	1.6	Form and Convene Advisory Board		X						X											
	1.7	Office Materials																			
		Purchase Office equipment			X	X															
		Purchase Communications equipment			X	X															
	1.8	Quarterly Task 1 Performance Assessments				X			X			X				X				X	
	1.9	Follow-on Contract 45-month Budget-Work Plan Development and Negotiation														X	X	X	X		
Task 2		Accreditation - SDSU Degrees																			
	2.1	Staffing Plan																			
		Engage SDSU Accreditation Team	H-4	X	X											H-4	X	X			
		Engage GE Partners Support Staff	H-3	X	X											H-3	X	X			
	2.2	Assemble Degree Programs Materials	X	X												X	X				
	2.3	Consulting/Services Agreements (Partners)																			
		Accreditation Coordinator		C	X											C	X				
		Translation of Degree Programs mat'ls		C	X											C	X				
	2.4	Applications Preparation and Submission																			
		Prepare and Submit Accreditation Packages		X													X				
		Process WASC Offcampus Accreditation		X													X				
	2.5	Quarterly Task 2 Performance Assessments				X			X			X			X					X	
Task 3		Articulation - Partner Courses																			
	3.1	Staffing Plan																			
		Engage Articulation Team Members		H-5	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			
		Engage GE Partners Support Staff		H-5	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X					
	3.2	Develop and Execute Articulation Plan			X																
		Implement Phase 1 Pilot (Partner GE Cses)			X	X		X			X				X						
		Implement Phase 2 Sustained (2 Cses/Partner/Qtr)				X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			
	3.3	Consulting/Services Agreements																			
		Translation Services (Partners)		C	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X					
		Curriculum Development (SDSU)				C	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			
		ABET Accreditation of Articulated Courses						C		X			X			X		X			
	3.4	Quarterly Task 3 Performance Assessments				X			X			X			X					X	
Task 4		English/STEM Institute																			
	4.1	Staffing Plan																			
		Engage a Director		H-1																	
		Engage Instructors		H-1	H-3	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			
		Recruit GE Assistant Director				H-1	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			
		Faculty (Oversight/QA)		H-1		X			X			X			X						
	4.2	English/STEM Strategy and Execution Plan		X	X																
	4.3	Consulting/Services Agreements																			

[illegible]

[illegible]

Annex 3 – Updated Five-Year Draft Budget and Work Plan

The rest of this page is left intentionally blank.

MCC/MCA - Georgia Project								
Title: SDSU - Georgia 2020								
MCC/MCA Budget July 28, 2014 - July 27, 2019								
Task 1	Business Unit Organization and Start-up							
	Staffing	Labor, Fringe Benefits, LOE				15-month Budget	45-month Budget	5-year Compact Total
		Ken Walsh, Interim Dean (SDSU)				\$ 280,938	\$ 89,902	\$ 370,839
		TBD Director - Business Finance (SDSURF)				\$ 203,000	\$ 69,601	\$ 272,601
		TBD, Director External Relations (GE				\$ 60,900	\$ -	\$ 60,900
		TBD, Administrative Support (GE-3/SDSU-1)				\$ 113,100	\$ 13,886	\$ 126,986
		TBD, Procurement/Accountant Support (GE				\$ 30,450	\$ 12,599	\$ 43,049
		TBD, Assistant Finance (GE-2)				\$ 60,900	\$ 23,743	\$ 84,643
		Janov, Budget/Contracts (SDSURF)				\$ 58,906	\$ -	\$ 58,906
		Crockett, Project Coordination (SDSURF)				\$ 54,375	\$ -	\$ 54,375
		TBD, SDSU Campus Program Coordination (SDSU)				\$ 54,375	\$ 125,988	\$ 180,363
		TBD, Director Faculty/Student Affairs (GE)				\$ 34,800	\$ -	\$ 34,800
		TBD, Director Admissions (SDSU)				\$ 91,350	\$ -	\$ 91,350
		TBD, Construction/Renovation Management (SDSU)				\$ 121,800	\$ 287,183	\$ 408,983
		TBD, Director of Facilities (GE)				\$ 34,800	\$ 25,198	\$ 59,998
		TBD, Director Information Technology Systems (GE)				\$ 34,800	\$ -	\$ 34,800
		TBD, Assistant Admissions (GE)				\$ 13,050	\$ -	\$ 13,050
		Total Staffing				\$ 1,247,544	\$ 648,099	\$ 1,895,642
	Travel	\$3500 R/T Airfare, \$341/day Per Diem, \$100/day Misc.						
		Ken Walsh, Interim Dean (SDSU) (1/qtr)				\$ 39,522	\$ -	\$ 39,522
		TBD Director - Business Finance (SDSU) (1/qtr)				\$ 32,935	\$ -	\$ 32,935
		TBD, Director Admissions (SDSU)				\$ 19,761	\$ -	\$ 19,761
		TBD, Construction/Renovation ESM Management (SDSU)				\$ 32,935	\$ 54,343	\$ 87,278
		Others (Provost, Deans, SDSURF, Department Chairs, etc.)				\$ 79,044	\$ -	\$ 79,044
		Advisory Board Meeting (Provost, Deans, SDSURF)				\$ 39,935	\$ -	\$ 39,935
		Periodic Senior Staff Visit (Deans, Dept Chairs, etc.)				\$ 118,566	\$ -	\$ 118,566
		SDSU hired GE Staff travel for training at SDSU				\$ 93,401	\$ -	\$ 93,401
		Total Travel				\$ 456,099	\$ 54,343	\$ 510,442
	Consultants/Services Agreements							
	<i>Professional Services</i>							
		Legal/Business Services (retainer)				\$ 180,000	\$ -	\$ 180,000
	<i>Staffing Support Services</i>						\$ -	
		HR Support/Temp Services (Start-up)				\$ 35,000	\$ -	\$ 35,000
		Procurement/ITAR Consultant				\$ 12,000	\$ 36,000	
		Total Consultants/Services Agreements				\$ 227,000	\$ 36,000	\$ 215,000
	Facilities Renovations/Outfitting							
		Offices, workspaces, meeting rooms; See Task 7				\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Other Direct Costs							
		Materials and Supplies				\$ 15,000	\$ -	\$ 15,000

		Office equipment (printers, laptops, software, maintenance, etc)				\$ 65,000	\$ -	\$ 65,000
		Communications (server, long distance, internet, cell phone, etc.)				\$ 60,000	\$ -	\$ 60,000
		Relocation Allowance (Dean, Director Business/Finance, Director Admissions, ESMP Manager)				\$ 120,000	\$ -	\$ 120,000
		Dependent Education Allowance (Dept of State rates)				\$ 24,150	\$ -	\$ 24,150
		Housing Allowance (up to 4 U.S. personnel)				\$ 138,233	\$ -	\$ 138,233
		International Medical Insurance (Georgia)				\$ 61,759	\$ -	\$ 61,759
		Academic Advisory Council (Deans/Dept Chairs - 9)				\$ 153,600	\$ -	\$ 153,600
		Staff transportation vehicle				\$ 18,500	\$ 18,500	\$ 37,000
		Promotional Materials				\$ 10,000	\$ -	\$ 10,000
		Total Other Direct Costs				\$ 666,242	\$ 18,500	\$ 684,742
		Subtotal Task 1: Direct Costs				\$ 2,596,885	\$ 756,941	\$ 3,353,827
		Indirect Costs (26% MTDC)				\$ 670,380	\$ 191,995	\$ 862,375
		Total Task 1: Business Unit Organization and Start-up				\$ 3,267,265	\$ 948,936	\$ 4,216,201
Task 2								
	Accreditation - SDSU Degrees							
	Staffing	Labor, Fringe Benefits, LOE						
		Faculty - Accreditation Team (SDSU)				\$ 20,480	\$ 12,595	\$ 33,075
		TBD, Administrative Support (SDSU)				\$ 1,813	\$ 2,229	\$ 4,042
		Total Staffing				\$ 22,293	\$ 14,825	\$ 37,117
	Travel	\$3500 R/T Airfare, \$341/day Per Diem, \$100/day Misc.						
		None Required				\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Consultants/Services Agreements							
	<i>Professional Services</i>							
		Consultant -- Coordination and Submission				\$ 10,000	\$ -	\$ 10,000
		Translation Services				\$ 50,000	\$ 25,000	\$ 75,000
		WASC Accreditation of Offcampus delivery of Degrees				\$ 4,000	\$ 3,000	\$ 7,000
		Total Consultant/Services Agreements				\$ 64,000	\$ 28,000	\$ 92,000
	Facilities Renovations/Outfitting							
		None Required				\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Other Direct Costs							
		Materials and Supplies				\$ 250	\$ 300	\$ 550
		Communications (long distance, internet, postal, etc.)				\$ 250	\$ 300	\$ 550
		Reproduction (copying, printing, etc.)				\$ 250	\$ 300	\$ 550
		Total Other Direct Costs				\$ 750	\$ 900	\$ 1,650
		Subtotal Task 2: Direct Costs				\$ 87,043	\$ 43,725	\$ 130,767

						\$ 22,631	\$ 11,368	\$ 33,999
		Indirect Costs (26% MTDC)						
		Total Task 2: Accreditation				\$ 109,674	\$ 55,093	\$ 164,767
Task 3	Articulation - Partner Courses							
	Staffing	Labor, Fringe Benefits, LOE						
		Faculty - Articulation Team (SDSU)				\$ 95,232	\$ 245,765	\$ 340,997
		TBD, Administrative Support (SDSU)				\$ 7,613	\$ 26,101	\$ 33,713
		Total Staffing				\$ 102,845	\$ 271,865	\$ 374,710
	Travel	\$3500 R/T Airfare, \$341/day Per Diem, \$100/day Misc.						
		None Required				\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
		Consultants/Services Agreements						
		Translation Services/Partner Support				\$ 24,000	\$ 45,000	\$ 69,000
		Curriculum Development Support/Services				\$ 96,000	\$ 180,000	\$ 276,000
		ABET Accreditation of GE Articulated Courses				\$ 24,000	\$ 72,000	\$ 96,000
		Total Consultants/Services Agreements				\$ 144,000	\$ 297,000	\$ 441,000
		Facilities Renovations/Outfitting						
		None Required				\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
		Other Direct Costs						
		Materials and Supplies				\$ 1,400	\$ 4,500	\$ 5,900
		Communications (long distance, internet, postal, etc.)				\$ 1,400	\$ 4,500	\$ 5,900
		Reproduction (copying, printing, etc.)				\$ 1,400	\$ 4,500	\$ 5,900
		Total Other Direct Costs				\$ 4,200	\$ 13,500	\$ 17,700
		Subtotal Task 3: Direct Costs				\$ 251,045	\$ 582,365	\$ 833,410
		Indirect Costs (26% MTDC)				\$ 65,272	\$ 151,415	\$ 216,687
		Total Task 3: Articulation				\$ 316,316	\$ 733,780	\$ 1,050,096
Task 4	English/STEM Institute							
	Staffing	Labor, Fringe Benefits, LOE						
		Director English/STEM Institute (SDSU)				\$ 101,500	\$ -	\$ 101,500

	Staff - Graduate Students/Instructors (SDSU)				\$ 154,722	\$ -	\$ 154,722
	Assistant Director (GE)				\$ 26,100	\$ -	\$ 26,100
	Faculty -- Program oversight/QA (SDS)				\$ 12,288	\$ -	\$ 12,288
	Total Staffing				\$ 294,610	\$ -	\$ 294,610
Travel	\$3500 R/T Airfare, \$341/day Per Diem, \$100/day Misc.						
	Director English/STEM Institute; Faculty QA				\$ 23,730	\$ -	\$ 23,730
	Staff - Graduate Students/Instructors				\$ 94,920	\$ -	\$ 94,920
	Faculty -- Program oversight/QA (SDSU)				\$ 19,761	\$ -	\$ 19,761
						\$ -	\$ -
						\$ -	\$ -
	Housing for Director and Teaching staff				\$ 97,500	\$ -	\$ 97,500
	Total Travel				\$ 235,911	\$ -	\$ 235,911
	Consultants/Services Agreements						
	CAST test (Listening and Speaking				\$ 3,000	\$ -	\$ 3,000
	English Placement Test (EPT)				\$ 4,500	\$ -	\$ 4,500
	WPA (Reading and Writing)				\$ 11,250	\$ -	\$ 11,250
	Chemistry Placement Exam				\$ 8,750	\$ -	\$ 8,750
	Mathe Placement Exam				\$ 5,000	\$ -	\$ 5,000
	Outreach, Recruitment, and Assessment Support Services				\$ 84,000	\$ -	\$ 84,000
	Total Consulting/Services Agreements				\$ 116,500	\$ -	\$ 116,500
	Facilities Renovations/Outfitting						
	Offices/classrooms; See Task 7				\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Other Direct Costs						
	Materials and Supplies				\$ 1,200	\$ -	\$ 1,200
	Communications (long distance, internet, postal, etc.)				\$ 1,200	\$ -	\$ 1,200
	Computer Equipment (4 laptops, 3 laser printers)				\$ 9,700	\$ -	\$ 9,700
	Reproduction (copying, printing, etc.)				\$ 1,200	\$ -	\$ 1,200
	Relocation Allowance for Director				\$ 30,000	\$ -	\$ 30,000
	International Medical Insurance (Georgia)				\$ 15,535	\$ -	\$ 15,535
	Total Other Direct Costs				\$ 58,835	\$ -	\$ 58,835
	Subtotal Task 4: Direct Costs				\$ 705,856	\$ -	\$ 705,856
	Indirect Costs (26% MTDC)				\$ 183,523	\$ -	\$ 183,523
	Total Task 4: English/STEM Institute				\$ 889,379	\$ -	\$ 889,379
					\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Task 5	Student Recruiting						

	Staffing	Labor, Fringe Benefits, LOE						
		Assist. Director Student/Faculty Affairs - (GE)				\$ 41,325	\$ -	\$ 41,325
		Assist. Admissions (records/transcripts/registration) (GE)				\$ 39,150	\$ -	\$ 39,150
		Total Staffing				\$ 80,475	\$ -	\$ 80,475
	Travel	\$3500 R/T Airfare, \$341/day Per Diem, \$100/day Misc.						
		None Required				\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
		Consultants/Services Agreements						
		SDSU CES: Recruitment Campaign - Socially Vulnerable				\$ 38,000	\$ -	\$ 38,000
		GE Marketing Firm				\$ 70,000	\$ -	\$ 70,000
		Student Assessment for enrollment, scholarships, aid, etc				\$ 100,000	\$ -	\$ 100,000
		Total Consultants/Services Agreements				\$ 208,000	\$ -	\$ 208,000
		Facilities Renovations/Outfitting						
		See Task 7; Office spaces at each Partner Institute				\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
		Other Direct Costs						
		Materials and Supplies				\$ 4,200	\$ -	\$ 4,200
		Communications (long distance, internet, postal, etc.)				\$ 4,200	\$ -	\$ 4,200
		Reproduction (copying, printing, etc.)				\$ 4,200	\$ -	\$ 4,200
		Marketing Materials for Outreach to women/minorities				\$ 25,000	\$ -	\$ 25,000
		Merit/Need-Based Scholarships and Aid				\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
		Total Other Direct Costs				\$ 37,600	\$ -	\$ 37,600
		Subtotal Task 5: Direct Costs				\$ 326,075	\$ -	\$ 326,075
		Indirect Costs (26% MTDC)				\$ 84,780	\$ -	\$ 84,780
		Total Task 5: Student Recruiting				\$ 410,855	\$ -	\$ 410,855
Task 6		GE Faculty Recruiting/Training						
	Staffing	Labor, Fringe Benefits, LOE						
		Assist. Director Student/Faculty Affairs - TSU (GE)				\$ 41,325	\$ 113,653	\$ 154,978
		SDSU Faculty Ambassadors (Start-up)				\$ 15,360	\$ -	\$ 15,360

		SDSU Faculty Trainers (Summer/Fall/Spring - Overload)				\$ 96,000	\$ 265,761	\$ 361,761
		Total Staffing				\$ 152,685	\$ 379,414	\$ 532,099
	Travel	\$3500 R/T Air, \$71/day Per Diem, \$1000 Misc, \$2,000 Stipend, \$341 J1 VISA - Housing provided						
		GE Faculty 5-week Summer Program Introduction				\$ 77,448	\$ -	\$ 77,448
		On-Campus Accomodations for Program Introduction				\$ 9,600	\$ -	\$ 9,600
		GE Faculty Semester Training Program				\$ 301,080	\$ 602,160	\$ 903,240
		APT accomodations for GE Faculty Training Program				\$ 57,600	\$ 153,600	\$ 211,200
		Total Travel				\$ 445,728	\$ 755,760	\$ 1,201,488
		Consultants/Services Agreements						
		None required				\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
		Facilities Renovations/Outfitting						
		See Task 7; Office spaces at each Partner Institute				\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
		Other Direct Costs						
		Materials and Supplies				\$ 4,000	\$ 12,000	\$ 16,000
		Reproduction (copying, printing, etc.)				\$ 2,000	\$ 6,000	\$ 8,000
		Hosting (accommodation supplies, kick-off event, etc.)				\$ 10,000	\$ 36,000	\$ 46,000
		Total Other Direct Costs				\$ 16,000	\$ 54,000	\$ 70,000
		Subtotal Task 6: Direct Costs				\$ 614,413	\$ 1,189,174	\$ 1,803,587
		Indirect Costs (26% MTDC)				\$ 159,747	\$ 309,185	\$ 468,933
		Total Task 6: Faculty Recruiting				\$ 774,160	\$ 1,498,360	\$ 2,272,520
Task 7	Facilities Development							
	Staffing	Labor, Fringe Benefits, LOE						
		TBD, Facilities Coordinators (SDSU) - 1 per degree + GE				\$ 28,420	\$ 112,071	\$ 140,491
	Travel	\$3500 R/T Airfare, \$341/day Per Diem, \$100/day Misc.						
		TBD, Facilities Coordinator (SDSU)				\$ 40,460	\$ 202,300	\$ 242,760
		Consultants/Services Agreements						
		<i>Architect/IFC Reports - Structural/MEP Designs - Phase 1b</i>						
		Architect and IFC Report				\$ 2,672	\$ -	\$ 2,672
		Structural and MEP Designs				\$ 1,603	\$ -	\$ 1,603
		<i>Architect/IFC Reports - Structural/MEP Designs - Phase 2</i>						

	Architect and IFC Report				\$ 5,274	\$ -	\$ 5,274
	Structural and MEP Designs				\$ 3,164	\$ -	\$ 3,164
	<i>Architect/IFC Reports - Structural/MEP Designs - Phase 3</i>						
	Architect and IFC Report				\$ 4,182	\$ -	\$ 4,182
	Structural and MEP Designs				\$ 2,509	\$ -	\$ 2,509
	<i>Architect/IFC Reports - Structural/MEP Designs - Phase 4</i>						
	Architect and IFC Report				\$ 53,535	\$ -	\$ 53,535
	Structural and MEP Designs				\$ 44,613	\$ -	\$ 44,613
	<i>Architect/IFC Reports - Structural/MEP Designs - Phases 5-9 (Enrollment)</i>						
	Architect and IFC Report				\$ -	\$ 20,888	\$ 20,888
	Structural and MEP Designs				\$ -	\$ 12,533	\$ 12,533
	<i>Design and Construction Management/Supervision Services</i>				\$ 142,644	\$ 197,939	\$ 340,583
	Subtotal Consultant/Services Agreements				\$ 260,197	\$ 231,359	\$ 491,557
	10% Contingency for Designs, Reports, Construction Management/Supervision				\$ 26,020	\$ 23,136	\$ 49,156
	Total Consultant/Services Agreements				\$ 286,217	\$ 254,495	\$ 540,712
	Facilities Renovations/Construction/Outfitting						
	<i>Pre-Enrollment Renovations Phase 1a - MCA Building (\$180/m²)</i>						
	Deans Office (350 sq ft)				\$ 5,855	\$ -	\$ 5,855
	Staff Offices (6 ea at 250 sq ft)				\$ 16,729	\$ -	\$ 16,729
	Admin Workstations (6 ea at 150 sq ft)				\$ 15,056	\$ -	\$ 15,056
	Conference/Meeting rooms (2 - 300 sq ft)				\$ 10,037	\$ -	\$ 10,037
	Total Renovations Phase 1a				\$ 47,677	\$ -	\$ 47,677
	<i>Pre-Enrollment Renovations Phase 1b - Tbilisi State (\$180/m²)</i>						
	English/STEM offices (3 - 250 sq ft)				\$ 12,546	\$ -	\$ 12,546
	English/STEM Classrooms (5 ea 1000 sq ft, 25 students)				\$ 83,643	\$ -	\$ 83,643
	Total Renovations Phase 1b				\$ 96,190	\$ -	\$ 96,190
	<i>Pre-Enrollment Renovations Phase 2 - Tbilisi State (\$180/m²)</i>						
	GE Smart Classrooms - with 30 computers				\$ 53,532	\$ -	\$ 53,532
	GE Lecture Hall- Media Center with 100 seats				\$ 40,149	\$ -	\$ 40,149
	Chemistry & General Education				\$ 16,729	\$ -	\$ 16,729
	Chemistry Environmental Laboratories				\$ 16,729	\$ -	\$ 16,729
	Physics Laboratory (TSU)				\$ 16,729	\$ -	\$ 16,729
	Program Offices (3 - 1GE and 2 Eng)				\$ 17,565	\$ -	\$ 17,565
	Laboratory Storerooms and Offices				\$ 28,439	\$ -	\$ 28,439
	Total Renovations Phase 2				\$ 189,870	\$ -	\$ 189,870
	<i>Pre-Enrollment Renovations Phase 3 - Georgia Technical (\$180/m²)</i>						
	Engineering/Sciences Classrooms- with 30 computers				\$ 53,532	\$ -	\$ 53,532
	Chemistry Environmental Laboratories				\$ 16,729	\$ -	\$ 16,729
	Program Offices				\$ 11,710	\$ -	\$ 11,710
	Laboratory Storerooms and Offices				\$ 28,439	\$ -	\$ 28,439
	GE Lecture Hall- Media Center with 100 seats				\$ 40,149	\$ -	\$ 40,149
	Total Renovations Phase 3				\$ 150,558	\$ -	\$ 150,558

		<i>Construction (Pre-Enrollment Design & RFP - Enrollment Construction) Phase 4/4b Ilia State</i>						
		Laboratory 2 - Courses CompE 270, 375, 470L			\$	-	\$ 81,413	\$ 81,413
		Laboratory 5 - Senior Design			\$	-	\$ 81,413	\$ 81,413
		Laboratory - Hydraulics			\$	-	\$ 101,766	\$ 101,766
		Laboratory - Structural			\$	-	\$ 203,670	\$ 203,670
		Laboratory - Geotechnical			\$	-	\$ 101,766	\$ 101,766
		Surveying Laboratory			\$	-	\$ 20,353	\$ 20,353
		Computer Classroom - 2 with 30 computers			\$	-	\$ 325,651	\$ 325,651
		Lecture Hall- Media Center with 100 seats			\$	-	\$ 244,238	\$ 244,238
		Library Digital Media Area			\$	-	\$ 244,238	\$ 244,238
		Laboratory Storeroom (2)			\$	-	\$ 101,766	\$ 101,766
		Laboratory Technician Offices (2)			\$	-	\$ 71,236	\$ 71,236
		Programs Offices (2 Engineering)			\$	-	\$ 71,236	\$ 71,236
		Communal Areas (halls, stairs, HVAC plant, etc)			\$	-	\$ 305,297	\$ 305,297
		Total Construction Phase 4			\$	-	\$ 1,954,042	\$ 1,954,042
		<i>Enrollment Renovations Phase 5 - Tbilisi EE/Comp Engineering (\$180/rh)</i>						
		Laboratory 1 Courses EE210, 330L, 430L			\$	-	\$ 13,383	\$ 13,383
		Laboratory 3 Digital Communications			\$	-	\$ 13,383	\$ 13,383
		Laboratory 5 Senior Design			\$	-	\$ 13,383	\$ 13,383
		Laboratory Antenna Microwave			\$	-	\$ 13,383	\$ 13,383
		Engineering Computer Classroom - with 30 computers			\$	-	\$ 26,766	\$ 26,766
		Laboratory Storerooms			\$	-	\$ 16,729	\$ 16,729
		Laboratory Technician Offices			\$	-	\$ 11,710	\$ 11,710
		Library Digital Media Area			\$	-	\$ 40,149	\$ 40,149
		Total Renovations Phase 5			\$	-	\$ 148,885	\$ 148,885
		<i>Enrollment Renovations Phase 6 - Tbilisi Chem/Comp Sci (\$180/rh)</i>						
		Chemistry 232, 432			\$	-	\$ 16,729	\$ 16,729
		Chemistry 417,427,457			\$	-	\$ 16,729	\$ 16,729
		Chemistry 457 Special			\$	-	\$ 16,729	\$ 16,729
		Chemistry 567			\$	-	\$ 16,729	\$ 16,729
		Sciences Computer Classroom			\$	-	\$ 26,766	\$ 26,766
		Laboratory Storerooms			\$	-	\$ 16,729	\$ 16,729
		Laboratory Technician Offices			\$	-	\$ 11,710	\$ 11,710
		Library Digital Media Area			\$	-	\$ 40,149	\$ 40,149
		Total Renovations Phase 6			\$	-	\$ 162,268	\$ 162,268
		<i>Enrollment Renovations Phase 7 - Tbilisi Classrooms/Other (\$180/rh)</i>						
		GE Smart Classrooms - with 30 computers			\$	-	\$ 26,766	\$ 26,766
		GE Lecture Hall- Media Center with 100 seats			\$	-	\$ 80,297	\$ 80,297
		Sciences Computer Classroom			\$	-	\$ 26,766	\$ 26,766
		Program Office			\$	-	\$ 5,855	\$ 5,855
		General (Communal/toilet facilities)			\$	-	\$ 30,112	\$ 30,112
		Total Renovations Phase 7			\$	-	\$ 169,796	\$ 169,796
		<i>Enrollment Renovations Phase 8 - Georgia Technical Labs (\$180/rh)</i>						
		Laboratory 1 Courses EE210, 330L, 430L			\$	-	\$ 13,383	\$ 13,383

	Laboratory 5 Senior Design				\$ -	\$ 13,383	\$ 13,383
	Laboratory EE Power Electronics				\$ -	\$ 13,383	\$ 13,383
	Laboratory Hydraulics				\$ -	\$ 16,729	\$ 16,729
	Laboratory Geotechnical				\$ -	\$ 16,729	\$ 16,729
	Surveying Laboratory				\$ -	\$ 3,346	\$ 3,346
	Chemistry 567				\$ -	\$ 16,729	\$ 16,729
	Laboratory Storerooms				\$ -	\$ 33,457	\$ 33,457
	Laboratory Technician Offices				\$ -	\$ 23,420	\$ 23,420
	Total Renovations Phase 8				\$ -	\$ 150,558	\$ 150,558
	<i>Enrollment Renovations Phase 9 - Georgia Classrooms/Other (\$180/m²)</i>						
	Engineering Computer Classroom - with 30 computers				\$ -	\$ 26,766	\$ 26,766
	Lecture Hall- Media Center with 60 seats				\$ -	\$ 23,420	\$ 23,420
	Library Digital Media Area				\$ -	\$ 40,149	\$ 40,149
	General (Communal/toilet facilities)				\$ -	\$ 30,112	\$ 30,112
	Total Renovations Phase 9				\$ -	\$ 120,446	\$ 120,446
	Subtotal Facilities Construction/Renovations				\$ 484,294	\$ 2,705,993	\$ 3,190,287
	10% Contingency Reserve (construction/renovations)				\$ 48,429	\$ 270,599	\$ 319,029
	Total Facilities Construction/Renovations				\$ 532,723	\$ 2,976,593	\$ 3,509,316
	<i>Furnishings - Tbilisi State University Phase 1a/1b</i>						
	Deans Office (350 sq ft)				\$ 5,000	\$ -	\$ 5,000
	Staff Offices (6 ea at 250 sq ft)				\$ 12,500	\$ -	\$ 12,500
	Admin Workstations (6 ea at 150 sq ft)				\$ 9,000	\$ -	\$ 9,000
	Conference/Meeting rooms (2 - 300 sq ft)				\$ 34,000	\$ -	\$ 34,000
	English/STEM Classrooms (5 ea for 25 students)				\$ 257,500	\$ -	\$ 257,500
	Total Furnishings Renovations Phase 1a/1b				\$ 318,000	\$ -	\$ 318,000
	<i>Furnishings - TSU and GTU Phases 2 and 3 (Pre-enrollment)</i>						
	GE Smart Classrooms - with 30 computers (2-TSU, 1-GTU)				\$ 312,000	\$ -	\$ 312,000
	GE Lecture Hall- Media Center with 100 seats (TSU)				\$ 59,000	\$ -	\$ 59,000
	Chemistry & General Education (TSU)	Material			\$ 136,000	\$ -	\$ 136,000
		Equipment			\$ 317,000	\$ -	\$ 317,000
	Chemistry, Environmental, General Education (TSU, GTU)	Material			\$ 164,000	\$ -	\$ 164,000
		Equipment			\$ 726,000	\$ -	\$ 726,000
	Physics Laboratory (TSU)				\$ 200,000	\$ -	\$ 200,000
	Laboratory Storerooms and Offices				\$ 7,500	\$ -	\$ 7,500
	Program Offices (4 - 1GE and 3 Eng) 3-TSU and 1-GTU				\$ 10,000	\$ -	\$ 10,000
	Laboratory Storerooms and Offices (4 - 3-TSU and 1-GTU)				\$ 10,000	\$ -	\$ 10,000
	Total Furnishings Renovations Phases 2/3				\$ 1,941,500	\$ -	\$ 1,941,500
	<i>Enrollment Furnishings Phase 4b - Ilia State</i>						
	Laboratory 2 - Courses CompE 270, 375, 470L	Material			\$ -	\$ 156,335	\$ 156,335

			Equipment			\$	-	\$ 212,400	\$ 212,400
		Laboratory 5 - Senior Design	Material			\$	-	\$ 130,370	\$ 130,370
			Equipment			\$	-	\$ 232,200	\$ 232,200
		Laboratory - Hydraulics	Material			\$	-	\$ 33,500	\$ 33,500
			Equipment			\$	-	\$ 464,900	\$ 464,900
		Laboratory - Structural	Material			\$	-	\$ 74,570	\$ 74,570
			Equipment			\$	-	\$ 337,400	\$ 337,400
		Laboratory - Geotechnical	Material			\$	-	\$ 109,970	\$ 109,970
			Equipment			\$	-	\$ 71,870	\$ 71,870
		Surveying Laboratory	Material			\$	-	\$ 24,500	\$ 24,500
			Equipment			\$	-	\$ 36,000	\$ 36,000
		Computer Classroom - 2 with 30 computers				\$	-	\$ 190,000	\$ 190,000
		Lecture Hall- Media Center with 100 seats				\$	-	\$ 104,000	\$ 104,000
		Library Digital Media Area				\$	-	\$ 59,000	\$ 59,000
		Laboratory Storeroom (2)				\$	-	\$ 118,000	\$ 118,000
		Laboratory Technician Offices (2)				\$	-	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000
		Programs Offices (2 Engineering)				\$	-	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000
		Total Furnishings Phase 4b				\$	-	\$ 2,365,015	\$ 2,365,015
		Enrollment Furnishings Phase 5 - Tbilisi EE/Comp Engineering							
		Laboratory 1 Courses EE210, 330L, 430L	Material			\$	-	\$ 285,170	\$ 285,170
			Equipment			\$	-	\$ 77,400	\$ 77,400
		Laboratory 3 Digital Communications	Material			\$	-	\$ 122,810	\$ 122,810
			Equipment			\$	-	\$ 198,000	\$ 198,000
		Laboratory 5 Senior Design	Material			\$	-	\$ 285,170	\$ 285,170
			Equipment			\$	-	\$ 77,400	\$ 77,400
		Laboratory Antenna Microwave	Material			\$	-	\$ 87,500	\$ 87,500
			Equipment			\$	-	\$ 1,812,075	\$ 1,812,075
		Engineering Computer Classroom - with 30 computers				\$	-	\$ 95,000	\$ 95,000
		Laboratory Storerooms				\$	-	\$ 2,500	\$ 2,500
		Laboratory Technician Offices				\$	-	\$ 2,500	\$ 2,500
		Library Digital Media Area				\$	-	\$ 59,000	\$ 59,000
		Total Furnishings Phase 5				\$	-	\$ 3,104,525	\$ 3,104,525
		Enrollment Furnishings Phase 6 - Tbilisi Chem/Comp Sci							
		Chemistry 232, 432	Material			\$	-	\$ 109,500	\$ 109,500
			Equipment			\$	-	\$ 947,000	\$ 947,000
		Chemistry 417,427,457	Material			\$	-	\$ 32,500	\$ 32,500
			Equipment			\$	-	\$ 260,000	\$ 260,000
		Chemistry 457 Special	Material			\$	-	\$ 57,500	\$ 57,500
			Equipment			\$	-	\$ 1,240,000	\$ 1,240,000
		Chemistry 567	Material			\$	-	\$ 40,000	\$ 40,000
			Equipment			\$	-	\$ 288,000	\$ 288,000
		Sciences Computer Classroom				\$	-	\$ 104,000	\$ 104,000
		Laboratory Storerooms				\$	-	\$ 2,500	\$ 2,500
		Laboratory Technician Offices				\$	-	\$ 2,500	\$ 2,500
		Library Digital Media Area				\$	-	\$ 59,000	\$ 59,000
		Total Furnishings Phase 6				\$	-	\$ 3,142,500	\$ 456,000

<i>Enrollment Furnishings Phase 7 - Tbilisi Classrooms/Other</i>								
	GE Smart Classrooms - with 30 computers				\$ -	\$ 95,000	\$ 95,000	
	GE Lecture Hall- Media Center with 100 seats				\$ -	\$ 118,000	\$ 118,000	
	Sciences Computer Classroom				\$ -	\$ 104,000	\$ 104,000	
	Program Office				\$ -	\$ 2,500	\$ 2,500	
	General (Communal/toilet facilities)				\$ -	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000	
	Total Furnishings Phase 7				\$ -	\$ 324,500	\$ 324,500	
<i>Enrollment Furnishings Phase 8 - Georgia Technical Labs</i>								
	Laboratory 1 Courses EE210, 330L, 430L	Material			\$ -	\$ 285,170	\$ 285,170	
		Equipment			\$ -	\$ 77,400	\$ 77,400	
	Laboratory 5 Senior Design	Material			\$ -	\$ 285,170	\$ 285,170	
		Equipment			\$ -	\$ 77,400	\$ 77,400	
	Laboratory EE Power Electronics	Material			\$ -	\$ 223,835	\$ 223,835	
		Equipment			\$ -	\$ 212,400	\$ 212,400	
	Laboratory Hydraulics	Material			\$ -	\$ 33,500	\$ 33,500	
		Equipment			\$ -	\$ 464,900	\$ 464,900	
	Laboratory Geotechnical	Material			\$ -	\$ 109,970	\$ 109,970	
		Equipment			\$ -	\$ 71,870	\$ 71,870	
	Surveying Laboratory	Material			\$ -	\$ 24,500	\$ 24,500	
		Equipment			\$ -	\$ 36,000	\$ 36,000	
	Chemistry 567	Material			\$ -	\$ 40,000	\$ 40,000	
		Equipment			\$ -	\$ 288,000	\$ 288,000	
	Laboratory Storerooms				\$ -	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000	
	Laboratory Technician Offices				\$ -	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000	
	Total Furnishings Phase 8				\$ -	\$ 2,240,115	\$ 2,240,115	
<i>Enrollment Furnishings Phase 9 - Georgia Classrooms/Other</i>								
	Engineering Computer Classroom - with 30 computers				\$ -	\$ 95,000	\$ 95,000	
	Lecture Hall- Media Center with 60 seats				\$ -	\$ 39,000	\$ 39,000	
	Library Digital Media Area				\$ -	\$ 59,000	\$ 59,000	
	General (Communal/toilet facilities)				\$ -	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000	
	Total Furnishings Phase 9				\$ -	\$ 198,000	\$ 198,000	
	Total Furnishings				\$ 2,259,500	\$ 11,374,655	\$ 13,634,155	
	Total Facilities Renovations/Construction/Outfitting				\$ 2,792,223	\$ 14,351,248	\$ 17,143,471	
Other Direct Costs								
	Laboratory Software				\$ 16,000	\$ 55,000	\$ 71,000	
	Laboratory Supplies				\$ 60,000	\$ -	\$ 60,000	
	Library resources				\$ 75,000	\$ 75,000	\$ 150,000	
	Eyewash Stations				\$ 2,200	\$ 2,750	\$ 4,950	
	Total Other Direct Costs				\$ 153,200	\$ 132,750	\$ 285,950	
	Subtotal Task 7: Direct Costs				\$ 3,300,520	\$ 15,052,864	\$ 18,353,384	
	Indirect Costs (26% MTDC)				\$ 448,447	\$ 1,194,351	\$ 1,642,798	

		Grand Total Task 7: Facilities Development				\$ 3,748,968	\$ 16,247,215	\$ 19,996,182
SUMMARY								
	Staffing	Labor, Fringe Benefits, LOE				\$ 1,928,871	\$ 1,426,274	\$ 3,355,145
	Travel	R/T Airfare, Per Diem, \$1000 Misc., Stipends, etc				\$ 1,178,198	\$ 1,012,403	\$ 2,190,601
		Consultants/Services Agreements				\$ 1,045,717	\$ 615,495	\$ 1,661,212
		Facilities Renovations including 10% reserve				\$ 532,723	\$ 2,976,593	\$ 3,509,316
		Facilities Outfitting (Equipment, furnishings, etc.)				\$ 2,259,500	\$ 11,374,655	\$ 13,634,155
		Other Direct Costs				\$ 936,827	\$ 219,650	\$ 1,156,477
		Subtotal Direct Costs				\$ 7,881,836	\$ 17,625,070	\$ 25,506,906
		Indirect Costs (26% MTDC)				\$ 1,634,779	\$ 1,858,314	\$ 3,493,094
		Total Direct Costs				\$ 9,516,616	\$ 19,483,384	\$ 29,000,000

MCC/MCA - Georgia Project								
Title: SDSU - Georgia 2020								
MCC/MCA Budget July 28, 2014 - October 27, 2015 Pre-enrollment Period of Performance								
Task 1	Business	Unit Organization and Start-up						
	Staffing	Labor, Fringe Benefits, LOE	Mnthly Sal	Fringe Rate	12-month Compensation	FTE	# Pers	Total Pre-enrollment
		Ken Walsh, Interim Dean (SDSU)	\$ 12,917	45%	\$ 224,750	100%	1	\$ 280,938
		TBD Director - Business Finance (SDSURF)	\$ 10,000	45%	\$ 174,000	100%	1	\$ 203,000
		TBD, Director External Relations (GE	\$ 3,000	45%	\$ 52,200	100%	1	\$ 60,900
		TBD, Administrative Support (GE-3/SDSU-1)	\$ 1,500	45%	\$ 26,100	100%	4	\$ 113,100
		TBD, Procurement/Accountant Support (GE	\$ 1,500	45%	\$ 26,100	100%	1	\$ 30,450
		TBD, Assistant Finance (GE-2)	\$ 1,500	45%	\$ 26,100	100%	2	\$ 60,900
		Janov, Budget/Contracts (SDSURF)	\$ 10,833	45%	\$ 188,500	25%	1	\$ 58,906
		Crockett, Project Coordination (SDSURF)	\$ 10,000	45%	\$ 174,000	25%	1	\$ 54,375
		TBD, SDSU Campus Program Coordination (SDSU)	\$ 5,000	45%	\$ 87,000	50%	1	\$ 54,375
		TBD, Director Faculty/Student Affairs (GE)	\$ 2,000	45%	\$ 34,800	100%	1	\$ 34,800
		TBD, Director Admissions (SDSU)	\$ 7,000	45%	\$ 121,800	100%	1	\$ 91,350
		TBD, Construction/Renovation Management (SDSU)	\$ 7,000	45%	\$ 121,800	100%	1	\$ 121,800
		TBD, Director of Facilities (GE)	\$ 2,000	45%	\$ 34,800	100%	1	\$ 34,800
		TBD, Director Information Technology Systems (GE)	\$ 2,000	45%	\$ 34,800	100%	1	\$ 34,800
		TBD, Assistant Admissions (GE)	\$ 1,500	45%	\$ 26,100	100%	1	\$ 13,050
		Total Staffing						\$ 1,247,544
	Travel	\$3500 R/T Airfare, \$341/day Per Diem, \$100/day Misc.	# Travelers	# Trips	# Days/Trip	Cost/Trip		
		Ken Walsh, Interim Dean (SDSU) (1/qtr)	1	6	7	\$ 6,587		\$ 39,522
		TBD Director - Business Finance (SDSU) (1/qtr)	1	5	7	\$ 6,587		\$ 32,935
		TBD, Director Admissions (SDSU)	1	3	7	\$ 6,587		\$ 19,761
		TBD, Construction/Renovation ESM Management (SDSU)	1	5	7	\$ 6,587		\$ 32,935
		Others (Provost, Deans, SDSURF, Department Chairs, etc.)	12	1	7	\$ 6,587		\$ 79,044
		Advisory Board Meeting (Provost, Deans, SDSURF)	7	1	5	\$ 5,705		\$ 39,935
		Periodic Senior Staff Visit (Deans, Dept Chairs, etc.)	6	3	7	\$ 6,587		\$ 118,566
		SDSU hired GE Staff travel for training at SDSU	11	1	15	\$ 8,491		\$ 93,401
		Total Travel						\$ 456,099
	Consultants/Services Agreements							
	<i>Professional Services</i>		Hrly Rate	Effort	Cost/Month	# Months		
		Legal/Business Services (retainer)	\$ 300	40	\$ 12,000	15		\$ 180,000
	<i>Staffing Support Services</i>		Hrly Rate		Cost/Month	# Months		
		HR Support/Temp Services (Start-up)			\$ 2,500	14		\$ 35,000
		Procurement/ITAR Consultant	\$ 100	120				\$ 12,000
		Total Consultants/Services Agreements						\$ 227,000

	Facilities Renovations/Outfitting							
		Offices, workspaces, meeting rooms; See Task 7						\$ -
	Other Direct Costs				Cost/Month	# Months		
		Materials and Supplies			\$ 1,000	15		\$ 15,000
		Office equipment (printers, laptops, software, maintenance, etc)			\$ 1,000	15		\$ 65,000
		Communications (server, long distance, internet, cell phone, etc.)			\$ 2,000	15		\$ 60,000
		Relocation Allowance (Dean, Director Business/Finance, Director Admissions, ESMP Manager)						\$ 120,000
		Dependent Education Allowance (Dept of State rates)						\$ 24,150
		Housing Allowance (up to 4 U.S. personnel)			\$ 2,658	15		\$ 138,233
		International Medical Insurance (Georgia)			\$ 1,165	15		\$ 61,759
		Academic Advisory Council (Deans/Dept Chairs - 9)						\$ 153,600
		Staff transportation vehicle						\$ 18,500
		Promotional Materials						\$ 10,000
		Total Other Direct Costs						\$ 666,242
		Subtotal Task 1: Direct Costs						\$ 2,596,885
		Indirect Costs (MTDC)	26%					\$ 670,380
		Total Task 1: Business Unit Organization and Start-up						\$ 3,267,265
Task 2	Accreditation-SDSU Degrees							
	Staffing	Labor, Fringe Benefits, LOE	Mnthly Sal	Fringe Rate	12-month Compensation	FTE	# Pers	Total Pre-enrollment
		Faculty - Accreditation Team (SDSU)	\$ 8,000	28%	\$ 122,880	20%	4	\$ 20,480
		TBD, Administrative Support (SDSU)	\$ 2,500	45%	\$ 43,500	20%	1	\$ 1,813
		Total Staffing						\$ 22,293
	Travel	\$3500 R/T Airfare, \$341/day Per Diem, \$100/day Misc.	# Travelers	# Trips	# Days/Trip	Cost/Trip		
		None Required						\$ -
	Consultants/Services Agreements							
		<i>Professional Services</i>	Rate	# Cses/Degs	Cost/Month	# Months		
		Consultant -- Coordination and Submission		N/A	\$ 4,000	2.5		\$ 10,000
		Translation Services	\$ 500	100				\$ 50,000
		WASC Accreditation of Offcampus delivery of Degrees	\$ 1,000	4				\$ 4,000
		Total Consultant/Services Agreements						\$ 64,000
	Facilities Renovations/Outfitting							
		None Required						\$ -
	Other Direct Costs				Cost/Month	# Months		

		Materials and Supplies			\$ 100	2.5		\$ 250
		Communications (long distance, internet, postal, etc.)			\$ 100	2.5		\$ 250
		Reproduction (copying, printing, etc.)			\$ 100	2.5		\$ 250
		Total Other Direct Costs						\$ 750
		Subtotal Task 2: Direct Costs						\$ 87,043
		Indirect Costs (MTDC)	26%					\$ 22,631
		Total Task 2: Accreditation						\$ 109,674
Task 3	Articulation - Partner Courses							
	Staffing	Labor, Fringe Benefits, LOE	Mnthly Sal	Fringe Rate	12-month Compensation	FTE	# Pers	Total Pre-enrollment
		Faculty - Articulation Team (SDSU)	\$ 8,000	28%	\$ 122,880	15%	5	\$ 95,232
		TBD, Administrative Support (SDSU)	\$ 2,500	45%	\$ 43,500	15%	1	\$ 7,613
		Total Staffing						\$ 102,845
	Travel	\$3500 R/T Airfare, \$341/day Per Diem, \$100/day Misc.	# Travelers	# Trips	# Days/Trip	Cost/Trip		
		None Required						\$ -
	Consultants/Services Agreements			# Courses	Unit Cost			
		Translation Services/Partner Support		48	\$ 500			\$ 24,000
		Curriculum Development Support/Services		24	\$ 4,000			\$ 96,000
		ABET Accreditation of Articulated Courses		24	\$ 1,000			\$ 24,000
		Total Consultants/Services Agreements						\$ 144,000
	Facilities Renovations/Outfitting							
		None Required						\$ -
	Other Direct Costs				Cost/Month	# Months		
		Materials and Supplies			\$ 100	14		\$ 1,400
		Communications (long distance, internet, postal, etc.)			\$ 100	14		\$ 1,400
		Reproduction (copying, printing, etc.)			\$ 100	14		\$ 1,400
		Total Other Direct Costs						\$ 4,200
		Subtotal Task 3: Direct Costs						\$ 251,045
		Indirect Costs (MTDC)	26%					\$ 65,272

		Total Task 3: Articulation						\$ 316,316
Task 4	English/STEM Institute							
	Staffing	Labor, Fringe Benefits, LOE	Mnthly Sal	Fringe Rate	12-month Compensation	FTE	# Pers	Total Pre-enrollment
		Director English/STEM Institute (SDSU)	\$ 5,000	45%	\$ 87,000	100%	1	\$ 101,500
		Staff - Graduate Students/Instructors (SDSU)	\$ 2,600	24%	\$ 38,681	100%	4	\$ 154,722
		Assistant Director (GE)	\$ 1,500	45%	\$ 26,100	100%	1	\$ 26,100
		Faculty -- Program oversight/QA (SDSU)	\$ 8,000	28%	\$ 122,880	10%	1	\$ 12,288
		Total Staffing						\$ 294,610
	Travel	\$3500 R/T Airfare, \$341/day Per Diem, \$100/day Misc.	# Travelers	# Trips	# Days/Trip	Cost/Trip		
		Director English/STEM Institute;	1	3	10	\$ 7,910		\$ 23,730
		Staff - Graduate Students/Instructors	4	3	10	\$ 7,910		\$ 94,920
		Faculty -- Program oversight/QA (SDSU)	1	3	7	\$ 6,587		\$ 19,761
			# apartments	Mnthly Rate	# Months	Cost/Apmt		
		Housing for Director and Teaching staff	3	2,500	13	\$ 32,500		\$ 97,500
		Total Travel						\$ 235,911
		Consultants/Services Agreements	Rate	# Students	Cost/Month	# Months		
		CAST test (Listening and Speaking)	\$ 12	250	N/A	N/A		\$ 3,000
		English Placement Test (EPT)	\$ 18	250	N/A	N/A		\$ 4,500
		WPA (Reading and Writing)	\$ 45	250	N/A	N/A		\$ 11,250
		Chemistry Placement Exam	\$ 35	250	N/A	N/A		\$ 8,750
		Mathe Placement Exam	\$ 20	250	N/A	N/A		\$ 5,000
		English/STEM Recruitment and Assessment Services			\$ 6,000	14		\$ 84,000
		Total Consulting/Services Agreements						\$ 116,500
		Facilities Renovations/Outfitting						
		Offices/classrooms; See Task 7						\$ -
		Other Direct Costs			Cost/Month	# Months		
		Materials and Supplies			\$ 100	12		\$ 1,200
		Communications (long distance, internet, postal, etc.)			\$ 100	12		\$ 1,200
		Computer Equipment (4 laptops, 3 laser printers)						\$ 9,700
		Reproduction (copying, printing, etc.)			\$ 100	12		\$ 1,200
		Relocation Allowance for Director						\$ 30,000

		International Medical Insurance (Georgia)			\$ 251	12		\$ 15,535
		Total Other Direct Costs						\$ 58,835
		Subtotal Task 4: Direct Costs						\$ 705,856
		Indirect Costs (MTDC)	26%					\$ 183,523
		Total Task 4: English/STEM Institute						\$ 889,379
Task 5	Student Recruiting							
	Staffing	Labor, Fringe Benefits, LOE	Mnthly Sal	Fringe Rate	12-month Compensation	FTE	# Pers	Total Pre-enrollment
		Assist. Director Student/Faculty Affairs - (GE)	\$ 1,500	45%	\$ 26,100	50%	3	\$ 41,325
		Assist. Admissions (records/transcripts/registration) (GE)	\$ 1,500	45%	\$ 26,100	100%	3	\$ 39,150
		Total Staffing						\$ 80,475
	Travel	\$3500 R/T Airfare, \$341/day Per Diem, \$100/day Misc.	# Travelers	# Trips	# Days/Trip	Cost/Trip		
		None Required						\$ -
	Consultants/Services Agreements		Rate	# Students	Cost/Month	# Months		
		SDSU CES: Recruitment Campaign - Socially Vulnerable			\$ 2,000	14		\$ 38,000
		Recruitment Consultant Services			\$ 5,000	14		\$ 70,000
		Student Assessment for enrollment, scholarships, aid, etc	\$ 200	500				\$ 100,000
		Total Consultants/Services Agreements						\$ 208,000
	Facilities Renovations/Outfitting							
		See Task 7; Office spaces at each Partner Institute						\$ -
	Other Direct Costs				Cost/Month	# Months		
		Materials and Supplies			\$ 300	14		\$ 4,200
		Communications (long distance, internet, postal, etc.)			\$ 300	14		\$ 4,200
		Reproduction (copying, printing, etc.)			\$ 300	14		\$ 4,200
		Outreach to women/minorities						\$ 25,000
		Total Other Direct Costs						\$ 37,600
		Subtotal Task 5: Direct Costs						\$ 326,075
		Indirect Costs (MTDC)	26%					\$ 84,780
		Total Task 5: Student Recruiting						\$ 410,855

Task 6	GE Faculty Recruiting/Training							
	Staffing	Labor, Fringe Benefits, LOE	Mnthly Sal	Fringe Rate	12-month Compensation	FTE	# Pers	Total Pre-enrollment
		Assist. Director Student/Faculty Affairs - (GE)	\$ 1,500	45%	\$ 26,100	50%	3	\$ 41,325
		SDSU Faculty Ambassadors (Start-up)	\$ 8,000	28%	\$ 122,880	25%	4	\$ 15,360
		SDSU Faculty Trainers (Summer/Fall/Spring - Overload)		28%	\$ 5,000		5	\$ 96,000
		Total Staffing						\$ 152,685
	Travel	\$3500 R/T Air, \$71/day Per Diem, \$1000 Misc, \$2,000 honorarium, \$341 J1 VISA - Housing provided	# Travelers	# Trips	# Days/Trip # Appts/trip	Cost/Trip Cost/accom		
		GE Faculty 5-week Summer Program Introduction	8	1	40	\$ 9,681		\$ 77,448
		On-Campus Accomodations for Program Introduction	8	1	40	\$ 1,200		\$ 9,600
		GE Faculty Semester Training Program	15	2	45	\$ 10,036		\$ 301,080
		APT accomodations for GE Faculty Training Program	15	2	8	\$ 3,600		\$ 57,600
		Total Travel						\$ 445,728
	Consultants/Services Agreements		Rate	Effort	Cost/Month	# Months		
		None required						\$ -
	Facilities Renovations/Outfitting							
		See Task 7; Office spaces at each Partner Institute						\$ -
	Other Direct Costs							
		Materials and Supplies	\$ 1,000	4				\$ 4,000
		Reproduction (copying, printing, etc.)	\$ 500	4				\$ 2,000
		Hosting (accomodation supplies, kick-off event, etc.)	\$ 2,500	4				\$ 10,000
		Total Other Direct Costs						\$ 16,000
		Subtotal Task 6: Direct Costs						\$ 614,413
	Indirect Costs (MTDC)		26%					\$ 159,747
		Total Task 6: Faculty Recruiting/Training						\$ 774,160
Task 7	Facilities Development							
	Staffing	Labor, Fringe Benefits, LOE	Mnthly Sal	Fringe Rate	12-month Compensation	FTE	# Pers	Total Pre-enrollment
		TBD, Facilities Coordinators (SDSU) - 1 per degree + Gen Ed	\$ 7,000	45%	\$ 121,800	10%	2	\$ 28,420
	Travel	\$3500 R/T Airfare, \$341/day Per Diem, \$100/day Misc.	# Travelers	# Trips	# Days/Trip	Cost/Trip		

	TBD, Facilities Coordinator (SDSU)	2	2	15	\$ 10,115		\$ 40,460
	Consultants/Services Agreements	Reno Rate/m²	Reno m²	Con Rate/m²	Con m²		
	<i>Architect/IFC Reports - Structural/MEP Designs - Phase 1b</i>						
	Architect and IFC Report	\$ 5	534			\$ 2,672	
	Structural and MEP Designs	\$ 3	534			\$ 1,603	
	<i>Architect/IFC Reports - Structural/MEP Designs - Phase 2</i>						
	Architect and IFC Report	\$ 5	1055			\$ 5,274	
	Structural and MEP Designs	\$ 3	1055			\$ 3,164	
	<i>Architect/IFC Reports - Structural/MEP Designs - Phase 3</i>						
	Architect and IFC Report	\$ 5	836			\$ 4,182	
	Structural and MEP Designs	\$ 3	836			\$ 2,509	
	<i>Architect/IFC Reports - Structural/MEP Designs - Phase 4</i>						
	Architect and IFC Report			\$ 30	1785	\$ 53,535	
	Structural and MEP Designs			\$ 25	1785	\$ 44,613	
	<i>Design and Construction Management/Supervision Services</i>	\$14000 + 15%		\$14000 + 15%		\$ 142,644	
	Subtotal Consultant/Services Agreements					\$ 260,197	
	10% Contingency for Designs, Reports, Construction Management/Supervision			10%		\$ 26,020	
	Total Consultant/Services Agreements					\$ 286,217	
	Facilities Renovations/Construction/Outfitting						
	<i>Pre-Enrollment Renovations Phase 1a - MCA Building (\$180/m²)</i>	Rate	# spaces	Sq ft	m²	Total m²	
	Deans Office (350 sq ft)	\$ 180	1	350	33	33	\$ 5,855
	Staff Offices (6 ea at 250 sq ft)	\$ 180	6	200	19	112	\$ 16,729
	Admin Workstations (6 ea at 150 sq ft)	\$ 180	6	150	14	84	\$ 15,056
	Conference/Meeting rooms (2 - 300 sq ft)	\$ 180	2	300	28	56	\$ 10,037
	Total Renovations Phase 1a					283	\$ 47,677
	<i>Pre-Enrollment Renovations Phase 1b - Tbilisi State (\$180/m²)</i>						
	English/STEM offices (3 - 250 sq ft)	\$ 180	3	250	23	70	\$ 12,546
	English/STEM Classrooms (5 ea 1000 sq ft, 25 students)	\$ 180	5	1000	93	465	\$ 83,643
	Total Renovations Phase 1b		8			534	\$ 96,190
	<i>Pre-Enrollment Renovations Phase 2 - Tbilisi State (\$180/m²)</i>	Rate	# spaces	Sq ft	m²	Total m²	
	GE Smart Classrooms - with 30 computers	\$ 180	2	1600	149	297	\$ 53,532
	GE Lecture Hall- Media Center with 100 seats	\$ 180	1	2400	223	223	\$ 40,149
	Chemistry & General Education	\$ 180	1	1000	93	93	\$ 16,729
	Chemistry Environmental Laboratories	\$ 180	1	1000	93	93	\$ 16,729
	Physics Laboratory (TSU)	\$ 180	1	1000	93	93	\$ 16,729
	Program Offices (3 - 1GE and 2 Eng)	\$ 180	3	350	33	98	\$ 17,565
	Laboratory Storerooms and Offices	\$ 180	2	850	79	158	\$ 28,439
	Total Renovations Phase 2		11			1055	\$ 189,870

<i>Pre-Enrollment Renovations Phase 3 - Georgia Technical (\$180/m²)</i>		Rate	# spaces	Sq ft	m²	Total m²	
	Engineering/Sciences Classrooms- with 30 computers	\$ 180	2	1600	149	297	\$ 53,532
	Chemistry Environmental Laboratories	\$ 180	1	1000	93	93	\$ 16,729
	Program Offices	\$ 180	2	350	33	65	\$ 11,710
	Laboratory Storerooms and Offices	\$ 180	2	850	79	158	\$ 28,439
	GE Lecture Hall- Media Center with 100 seats	\$ 180	1	2400	223	223	\$ 40,149
	Total Renovations Phase 3		8			836	\$ 150,558
<i>Pre-enrollment Construction (Design & RFP) Phase 4 - Ilia State</i>		Rate	# spaces	Sq ft	m²	Total m²	
	Laboratory 2 - Courses CompE 270, 375, 470L	\$ 1,095	1	800	74	74	\$ -
	Laboratory 5 - Senior Design	\$ 1,095	1	800	74	74	\$ -
	Laboratory - Hydraulics	\$ 1,095	1	1,000	93	93	\$ -
	Laboratory - Structural	\$ 1,095	1	1,000	186	186	\$ -
	Laboratory - Geotechnical	\$ 1,095	1	1,000	93	93	\$ -
	Surveying Laboratory	\$ 1,095	1	200	19	19	\$ -
	Computer Classroom - 2 with 30 computers	\$ 1,095	2	1,600	149	297	\$ -
	Lecture Hall- Media Center with 100 seats	\$ 1,095	1	2,400	223	223	\$ -
	Library Digital Media Area	\$ 1,095	1	2,400	223	223	\$ -
	Laboratory Storeroom (2)	\$ 1,095	2	500	46	93	\$ -
	Laboratory Technician Offices (2)	\$ 1,095	2	350	33	65	\$ -
	Programs Offices (2 Engineering)	\$ 1,095	2	350	33	65	\$ -
	Communal Areas (halls, stairs, HVAC plant, etc)	\$ 1,095	1	3,000	279	279	\$ -
	Total Construction Phase 4		17			1785	\$ -
	Subtotal Facilities Construction/Renovations						\$ 484,294
10% Contingency Reserve (construction/renovations)							\$ 48,429
	Total Facilities Construction/Renovations						\$ 532,723
<i>Furnishings - Tbilisi State University Phase 1a/1b</i>			# spaces	Furnishing	Mat'l/Equip		
	Deans Office (350 sq ft)		1	\$ 5,000			\$ 5,000
	Staff Offices (6 ea at 250 sq ft)		6	\$ 2,500			\$ 12,500
	Admin Workstations (6 ea at 150 sq ft)		6	\$ 1,500			\$ 9,000
	Conference/Meeting rooms (2 - 300 sq ft)		2	\$ 12,000	\$ 5,000		\$ 34,000
	English/STEM Classrooms (5 ea for 25 students)		5	\$ 20,000	\$ 31,500		\$ 257,500
	Total Furnishings Renovations Phase 1a/1b		20				\$ 318,000
<i>Furnishings - TSU and GTU Phases 2 and 3 (Pre-enrollment)</i>			# spaces	Furnishing	Mat'l/Equip		
	GE Smart Classrooms - with 30 computers (2-TSU, 1-GTU)		3	\$ 20,000	\$ 84,000		\$ 312,000
	GE Lecture Hall- Media Center with 100 seats (TSU)		1	\$ 50,000	\$ 9,000		\$ 59,000
	Chemistry & General Education (TSU)		1	\$ 20,000	\$ 116,000	<i>M</i>	\$ 136,000
			1	N/A	\$ 317,000	<i>E</i>	\$ 317,000
	Chemistry, Environmental, General Education (TSU, GTU)		2	\$ 20,000	\$ 62,000	<i>M</i>	\$ 164,000
			2	N/A	\$ 363,000	<i>E</i>	\$ 726,000
	Physics Laboratory (TSU)		1	\$ 20,000	\$ 180,000	<i>M</i>	\$ 200,000
	Laboratory Storerooms and Offices		3	\$ 2,500			\$ 7,500
	Program Offices (4 - 1GE and 3 Eng) 3-TSU and 1-GTU		4	\$ 2,500			\$ 10,000

	Laboratory Storerooms and Offices (4 - 3-TSU and 1-GTU)	4	\$ 2,500		\$ 10,000
	Total Furnishings Renovations Phases 2/3	22			\$ 1,941,500
	Total Furnishings				\$ 2,259,500
	Total Facilities Renovations/Construction/Outfitting				\$ 2,792,223
	Other Direct Costs	qty	Unit Cost		
	Laboratory Software	4	\$ 4,000		\$ 16,000
	Laboratory Supplies	4	\$ 15,000		\$ 60,000
	Library resources				\$ 75,000
	Eyewash Stations	8	\$ 275		\$ 2,200
	Total Other Direct Costs				\$ 153,200
	Subtotal Task 7: Direct Costs				\$ 3,300,520
	Indirect Costs (MTDC)	26%			\$ 448,447
	Grand Total Task 7: Facilities Development				\$ 3,748,968
SUMMARY					
Staffing	Labor, Fringe Benefits, LOE				\$ 1,928,871
Travel	R/T Airfare, Per Diem, Misc., Stipends, etc				\$ 1,178,198
	Consultants/Services Agreement:				\$ 1,045,717
	Facilities Renovations including 10% reserv				\$ 532,723
	Facilities Outfitting (Equipment, furnishings, etc				\$ 2,259,500
	Other Direct Costs				\$ 936,827
	Total Direct Costs				\$ 7,881,836
	Indirect Costs (MTDC)	26%			\$ 1,634,779
	Total Pre-Enrollment Cost Projection				\$ 9,516,616
	Less Renovations managed by MCA-Georgia				\$ 532,723
	TOTAL DELIVERY ORDER:				\$ 8,983,893

MCC/MCA - Georgia Project														
Title: SDSU - Georgia 2020														
MCC/MCA Budget October 2015 - July 2019 Enrollment Period of Operations														
Task 1	Business Unit Operations													
	Staffing	Labor, Fringe Benefits, LOE	Mnthly Sal	Fringe Rate	12-month Compensation	FTE	# Pers	COLA 2.5%	9-month budget	12-month Budget	12-month Budget	12-month Budget	45-Month Total	
		Ken Walsh, Interim Dean (SDSU)	\$ 12,917	45%	\$ 224,750	100%	1	2.5%	\$ 17,278	\$ 23,613	\$ 24,203	\$ 24,808	\$ 89,902	
		TBD Director - Business Finance (SDSURF)	\$ 10,000	45%	\$ 174,000	100%	1	2.5%	\$ 13,376	\$ 18,281	\$ 18,738	\$ 19,206	\$ 69,601	
		TBD, Director External Relations (GE)	\$ 3,000	45%	\$ 52,200	100%	1		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
		TBD, Administrative Support (GE-3/SDSU-1)	\$ 1,000	45%	\$ 17,400	100%	4	2.5%	\$ 3,344	\$ 3,428	\$ 3,513	\$ 3,601	\$ 13,886	
		TBD, Procurement/Accountant Support (GE)	\$ 1,000	45%	\$ 17,400	100%	1	2.5%	\$ 3,344	\$ 4,570	\$ 4,684	\$ -	\$ 12,599	
		TBD, Assistant Finance (GE-2)	\$ 1,500	45%	\$ 26,100	100%	2	2.5%	\$ 10,032	\$ 13,711	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 23,743	
		Janov, Budget/Contracts (SDSURF)	\$ 10,833	45%	\$ 188,500	25%	1	2.5%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
		Crockett, Project Coordination (SDSURF)	\$ 10,000	45%	\$ 174,000	25%	1	2.5%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
		TBD, SDSU Campus Program Coordination (SDSU)	\$ 5,000	45%	\$ 87,000	50%	1	2.5%	\$ 33,441	\$ 45,702	\$ 46,845	\$ -	\$ 125,988	
		TBD, Director Faculty/Student Affairs (GE)	\$ 2,000	45%	\$ 34,800	100%	1		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
		TBD, Director Admissions (SDSU)	\$ 7,000	45%	\$ 121,800	100%	1		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
		TBD, Construction/Renovation Management (SDSU)	\$ 7,000	45%	\$ 121,800	100%	1	2.5%	\$ 93,634	\$ 127,966	\$ 65,583	\$ -	\$ 287,183	
		TBD, Director of Facilities (GE)	\$ 2,000	45%	\$ 34,800	100%	1	2.5%	\$ 6,688	\$ 9,140	\$ 9,369	\$ -	\$ 25,198	
		TBD, Director Information Technology Systems (GE)	\$ 2,000	45%	\$ 34,800	100%	1		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
		TBD, Assistant Admissions (GE)	\$ 1,000	45%	\$ 17,400	100%	1		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
		Total Staffing							\$ 181,137	\$ 246,411	\$ 172,935	\$ 47,616	\$ 648,099	
	Travel	\$3500 R/T Airfare, \$341/day Per Diem, \$100 Misc.	# Travelers	# Trips	# Days/Trip	Cost/Trip								
		Ken Walsh, Interim Dean (SDSU) (1/qr)	1	4	7	\$ 6,587			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
		TBD Associate Dean - Business Finance (SDSU) (1/qr)	1	4	7	\$ 6,587			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
		TBD, Director Admissions (SDSU)	1	3	7	\$ 6,587			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
		TBD, Construction/Renovation ESM Management (SDSU)	1	3	7	\$ 6,587			\$ 19,761	\$ 19,761	\$ 14,821	\$ -	\$ 54,343	
		Others (Provost, Deans, SDSURF, Department Chairs, etc.)	12	1	7	\$ 6,587			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
		Advisory Board Meeting (Provost, Deans, SDSURF)	7	1	5	\$ 5,705			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
		Periodic Senior Staff Visit (Deans, Dept Chairs, etc.)	6	3	7	\$ 6,587			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
		SDSU hired GE Staff travel for training at SDSU	11	1	15	\$ 10,115			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
		Total Travel							\$ 19,761	\$ 19,761	\$ 14,821	\$ -	\$ 54,343	
	Consultants/Services Agreements													
	Professional Services		Hrly Rate	Effort	Cost/Month	# Months								
		Legal/Business Services (retainer)	\$ 300	20	\$ 6,000	12			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
	Staffing Support Services		Rate/Month	# Staff	Cost/Month	# Months								
		HR Support/Temp Services (Start-up)	\$ 1,500	4	\$ 6,000	3			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
		Procurement/ITAR Consultant	\$ 100	120					\$ 12,000	\$ 12,000	\$ 12,000	\$ -	\$ 36,000	
		Total Consultants/Services Agreements							\$ 12,000	\$ 12,000	\$ 12,000	\$ -	\$ 36,000	
	Facilities Renovations/Outfitting													
		Offices, workspaces, meeting rooms; See Task 7							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
	Other Direct Costs													
		Materials and Supplies							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
		Office equipment (printers, laptops, software, maintenance, etc)							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
		Communications (server, long distance, internet, cell phone, etc.)							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
		Relocation Allowance (Dean, Director Business/Finance, Director Admissions, ESMP Manager)							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
		Dependent Education Allowance (Dept of State rates)							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
		Housing Allowance (up to 4 U.S. personnel)							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
		International Medical Insurance (Georgia)							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
		Academic Advisory Council (Deans/Dept Chairs - 9)							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
		Staff transportation vehicle							\$ 18,500	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 18,500	
		Promotional Materials							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
		Total Other Direct Costs							\$ 18,500	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 18,500	
	Subtotal Task 1: Direct Costs								\$ 231,398	\$ 278,172	\$ 199,756	\$ 47,616	\$ 756,941	
	Indirect Costs (MTDC)	26%							\$ 55,353	\$ 72,325	\$ 51,937	\$ 12,380	\$ 191,995	
	Total Task 1: Business Unit Operations								\$ 286,751	\$ 350,497	\$ 251,692	\$ 59,996	\$ 948,936	
Task 2	Accreditation-SDSU Degrees													
	Staffing	Labor, Fringe Benefits, LOE	Mnthly Sal	Fringe Rate	12-month Compensation	FTE	# Pers	COLA	Oct 1, 2015 Jun 30, 2016	Jul 1, 2016 June 30, 2017	Jul 1, 2017 Jun 30, 2018	Jul 1, 2018 Jun 30, 2019	45-Month Total	
		Faculty - Accreditation Team (SDSU)	\$ 8,000	28%	\$ 122,880	20%	2	2.5%	\$ 12,595	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 12,595	
		TBD, Administrative Support (SDSU)	\$ 2,500	45%	\$ 43,500	20%	1	2.5%	\$ 2,229	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,229	
		Total Staffing							\$ 14,825	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 14,825	
	Travel	\$2500 R/T Airfare, \$341/day Per Diem, \$1000 Misc.	# Travelers	# Trips	# Days/Trip	Cost/Trip								

		None Required								\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
		Consultants/Services Agreements												
		<i>Professional Services</i>	Rate	# Cses/Degs	Cost/Month	# Months								
		Consultant -- Coordination and Submission								\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
		Translation Services for SDSU courses for each degree	\$ 500	25						\$ 25,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 25,000
		WASC Accreditation of Offcampus delivery of Degrees	\$ 1,000	3						\$ 3,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,000
		Total Consultant/Services Agreements								\$ 28,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 28,000
		Facilities Renovations/Outfitting												
		None Required								\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
		Other Direct Costs			Cost/Month	# Months								
		Materials and Supplies			\$ 100	3				\$ 300	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 300
		Communications (long distance, internet, postal, etc.)			\$ 100	3				\$ 300	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 300
		Reproduction (copying, printing, etc.)			\$ 100	3				\$ 300	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 300
		Total Other Direct Costs								\$ 900	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 900
		Subtotal Task 2: Direct Costs								\$ 43,725	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 43,725
		Indirect Costs (MTDC)	26%							\$ 11,368	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 11,368
		Total Task 2: Accreditation								\$ 55,093	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 55,093
Task 3	Articulation - Partner Courses													
	Staffing	Labor, Fringe Benefits, LOE	Mnthly Sal	Fringe Rate	12-month Compensation	FTE	# Pers	COLA		Oct 1, 2015 Jun 30, 2016	Jul 1, 2016 June 30, 2017	Jul 1, 2017 Jun 30, 2018	Jul 1, 2018 Jun 30, 2019	45-Month Total
		Faculty - Articulation Team (SDSU) - Phase 1	\$ 8,000	28%	\$ 122,880	10%	5	2.5%	\$ 47,232	\$ 64,550	\$ 66,164	\$ 67,818	\$ 245,765	
		TBD, Administrative Support (SDSU)	\$ 2,500	45%	\$ 43,500	15%	1	2.5%	\$ 5,016	\$ 6,855	\$ 7,027	\$ 7,202	\$ 26,101	
		Total Staffing							\$ 52,248	\$ 71,406	\$ 73,191	\$ 75,021	\$ 271,865	
	Travel	\$3500 R/T Airfare, \$341/day Per Diem, \$100/day Misc.	# Travelers	# Trips	# Days/Trip	Cost/Trip								
		None Required							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
		Consultants/Services Agreements	Rate	# Cses/Degs	Cost/Month	# Months								
		Translation Services/Partner Support	\$ 500	24					\$ 9,000	\$ 12,000	\$ 12,000	\$ 12,000	\$ 45,000	
		Curriculum Development Support/Services	\$ 2,000	24					\$ 36,000	\$ 48,000	\$ 48,000	\$ 48,000	\$ 180,000	
		ABET Accreditation of GE Articulated Courses	\$ 1,000	24					\$ 18,000	\$ 18,000	\$ 18,000	\$ 18,000	\$ 72,000	
		Total Consultants/Services Agreements							\$ 63,000	\$ 78,000	\$ 78,000	\$ 78,000	\$ 297,000	
		Facilities Renovations/Outfitting												
		None Required							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
		Other Direct Costs												
		Materials and Supplies							\$ 900	\$ 1,200	\$ 1,200	\$ 1,200	\$ 4,500	
		Communications (long distance, internet, postal, etc.)							\$ 900	\$ 1,200	\$ 1,200	\$ 1,200	\$ 4,500	
		Reproduction (copying, printing, etc.)							\$ 900	\$ 1,200	\$ 1,200	\$ 1,200	\$ 4,500	
		Total Other Direct Costs							\$ 2,700	\$ 3,600	\$ 3,600	\$ 3,600	\$ 13,500	
		Subtotal Task 3: Direct Costs							\$ 117,948	\$ 153,006	\$ 154,791	\$ 156,621	\$ 582,365	
		Indirect Costs (MTDC)	26%						\$ 30,667	\$ 39,781	\$ 40,246	\$ 40,721	\$ 151,415	
		Total Task 3: Articulation							\$ 148,615	\$ 192,787	\$ 195,036	\$ 197,342	\$ 733,780	
Task 4	English/STEM Institute													
	Staffing	Labor, Fringe Benefits, LOE	Mnthly Sal	Fringe Rate	12-month Compensation	FTE	# Pers		Oct 1, 2015 Jun 30, 2016	Jul 1, 2016 June 30, 2017	Jul 1, 2017 Jun 30, 2018	Jul 1, 2018 Jun 30, 2019	45-Month Total	
		Director English/STEM Institute (SDSU/GE)	\$ 3,000	45%	\$ 52,200	100%	1		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
		Staff - Graduate Students/Instructors (SDSU)	\$ 2,600	17%	\$ 36,497	100%	8		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
		Assistant Director (GE)	\$ 1,000	45%	\$ 17,400	100%	1		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
		Faculty -- Program oversight/QA	\$ 5,000	28%		25%	1		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
		Total Staffing							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
	Travel	\$2500 R/T Airfare, \$341/day Per Diem, \$1000 Misc.	# Travelers	# Trips	# Days/Trip	Cost/Trip								
		Director English/STEM Institute (SDSU/GE)	1	3	10	\$ 7,910			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
		Staff - Graduate Students/Instructors	4	3	10	\$ 7,910			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	

	Faculty -- Program oversight/QA (SDSU)	1	3	7	\$ 6,587				\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
		# apartments	Mnthly Rate	# Months	Cost/Apmt									
	Housing for Director and Teaching staff	5	1,000	12	\$ 12,000				\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total Travel								\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Consultants/Services Agreements	Rate	# Students	Cost/Month	# Months									
	CAST test (Listening and Speaking)	\$ 12	250	N/A	N/A				\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	English Placement Test (EPT)	\$ 18	250	N/A	N/A				\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	WPA (Reading and Writing)	\$ 45	250	N/A	N/A				\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Chemistry Placement Exam	\$ 35	250	N/A	N/A				\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Mathe Placement Exam	\$ 20	250	N/A	N/A				\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	English/STEM Recruitment and Assessment Services			\$ 6,000	N/A				\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total Consulting/Services Agreements								\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Facilities Renovations/Outfitting													
	Offices/classrooms; See Task 7								\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Other Direct Costs													
	Materials and Supplies								\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Communications (long distance, internet, postal, etc.)								\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Computer Equipment (4 laptops, 3 laser printers)								\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Reproduction (copying, printing, etc.)								\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Relocation Allowance for Director								\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	International Medical Insurance (Georgia)								\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total Other Direct Costs								\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Subtotal Task 4: Direct Costs								\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Indirect Costs (MTDC)	26%							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total Task 4: English/STEM Institute								\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Task 5	Student Recruiting													
	Staffing Labor, Fringe Benefits, LOE	Mnthly Sal	Fringe Rate	12-month Compensation	FTE	# Pers	COLA		Oct 1, 2015 Jun 30, 2016	Jul 1, 2016 June 30, 2017	Jul 1, 2017 Jun 30, 2018	Jul 1, 2018 Jun 30, 2019	45-Month Total	
	Assist. Director Student/Faculty Affairs - (GE)	\$ 1,500	45%	\$ 26,100	25%	3	2.5%		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Assist. Admissions (records/transcripts/registration) (GE)	\$ 1,500	45%	\$ 26,100	25%	3	2.5%		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total Staffing								\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Travel \$3500 R/T Airfare, \$341/day Per Diem, \$100/day Misc.	# Travelers	# Trips	# Days/Trip	Cost/Trip									
	None Required								\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Consultants/Services Agreements	Rate	Effort	Cost/Month	# Months									
	SDSU CES: Recruitment Campaign - Socially Vulnerable			\$ 2,000	12				\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Recruitment Consultant Services			\$ 2,500	12				\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Student Assessment for enrollment, scholarships, aid, etc	\$ 200	400						\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total Consultants/Services Agreements								\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Facilities Renovations/Outfitting													
	See Task 7; Office spaces at each Partner Institute								\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Other Direct Costs													
	Materials and Supplies								\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Communications (long distance, internet, postal, etc.)								\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Reproduction (copying, printing, etc.)								\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Marketing Materials for Outreach to women/minorities								\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Merit/Need-Based Scholarships and Aid								\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total Other Direct Costs								\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Subtotal Task 5: Direct Costs								\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Indirect Costs (MTDC)	26%							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total Task 5: Student Recruiting								\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -

Task 6	GE Faculty Recruiting/Training												
	Staffing	Labor, Fringe Benefits, LOE	Mnthly Sal	Fringe Rate	12-month Compensation	FTE	# Pers	COLA	Oct 1, 2015 Jun 30, 2016	Jul 1, 2016 June 30, 2017	Jul 1, 2017 Jun 30, 2018	Jul 1, 2018 Jun 30, 2019	45-Month Total
		Assist. Director Student/Faculty Affairs - TSU (GE)	\$ 1,500	45%	\$ 26,100	50%	3	2.5%	\$ 30,097	\$ 41,132	\$ 21,080	\$ 21,345	\$ 113,653
		SDSU Faculty Ambassadors (Start-up)	\$ 8,000	28%	\$ 122,880	25%	4	2.5%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
		SDSU Faculty Trainers (Fall/Spring - Overload)		28%	\$ 5,000		5		\$ 64,000	\$ 65,600	\$ 67,240	\$ 68,921	\$ 265,761
		Total Staffing							\$ 94,097	\$ 106,732	\$ 88,320	\$ 90,266	\$ 379,414
	Travel	\$3500 R/T Air, \$71/day Per Diem, \$1000 Misc, \$2,000 Stipend, \$341 J1 VISA - Housing provided	# Travelers	# Trips	# Days/Trip # Appts/trip	Cost/Trip Cost/accom	# months						
		GE Faculty 5-week Summer Program Introduction	8	2	40	\$ 9,681	N/A		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
		On-Campus Accomodations for Program Introduction	8	2	40	\$ 9,681	N/A		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
		GE Faculty Semester Training Program	15	2	45	\$ 10,036	N/A		\$ 150,540	\$ 150,540	\$ 150,540	\$ 150,540	\$ 602,160
		APT accomodations for GE Faculty Training Program	15	2	8	\$ 1,200	2		\$ 38,400	\$ 38,400	\$ 38,400	\$ 38,400	\$ 153,600
		Total Travel							\$ 188,940	\$ 188,940	\$ 188,940	\$ 188,940	\$ 755,760
	Consultants/Services Agreements	Rate	Effort	Cost/Month	# Months								
		None required							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Facilities Renovations/Outfitting												
		See Task 7; Office spaces at each Partner Institute							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Other Direct Costs												
		Materials and Supplies							\$ 3,000	\$ 3,000	\$ 3,000	\$ 3,000	\$ 12,000
		Reproduction (copying, printing, etc.)							\$ 1,500	\$ 1,500	\$ 1,500	\$ 1,500	\$ 6,000
		Hosting (accommodation supplies, kick-off event, etc.)							\$ 9,000	\$ 9,000	\$ 9,000	\$ 9,000	\$ 36,000
		Total Other Direct Costs							\$ 13,500	\$ 13,500	\$ 13,500	\$ 13,500	\$ 54,000
		Subtotal Task 6: Direct Costs							\$ 296,537	\$ 309,172	\$ 290,760	\$ 292,706	\$ 1,189,174
	Indirect Costs (MTDC)	26%							\$ 77,100	\$ 80,385	\$ 75,598	\$ 76,103	\$ 309,185
	Total Task 6: Faculty Recruiting/Training								\$ 373,636	\$ 389,557	\$ 366,358	\$ 368,809	\$ 1,498,360
Task 7	Facilities Development												
	Staffing	Labor, Fringe Benefits, LOE	Mnthly Sal	Fringe Rate	12-month Compensation	FTE	# Pers	COLA	Oct 1, 2015 Jun 30, 2016	Jul 1, 2016 June 30, 2017	Jul 1, 2017 Jun 30, 2018	Jul 1, 2018 Jun 30, 2019	45-Month Total
		TBD, Facilities Coordinators (SDSU) - 1 per degree + GE	\$ 7,000	45%	\$ 121,800	10%	4	2.5%	\$ 36,540	\$ 49,938	\$ 25,593	\$ -	\$ 112,071
	Travel	\$3500 R/T Airfare, \$341/day Per Diem, \$100/day Misc.	# Travelers	# Trips	# Days/Trip	Cost/Trip							
		TBD, Facilities Coordinators (SDSU)	4	2	15	\$ 10,115			\$ 80,920	\$ 80,920	\$ 40,460	\$ -	\$ 202,300
	Consultants/Services Agreements	Reno Rate/m²	Reno m²										
		<i>Architect/IFC Reports - Structural/MEP Designs - Phases 5-9 (Enrollment)</i>											
		Architect and IFC Report	\$ 5	4178					\$ 20,888	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 20,888
		Structural and MEP Designs	\$ 3	4178					\$ 12,533	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 12,533
		<i>Design and Construction Management/Supervision Services</i>	\$14000 +10%						\$ 197,939	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 197,939
		Subtotal Consultant/Services Agreements							\$ 231,359	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 231,359
		10% Contingency for Designs, Reports, Construction Management/Supervision			10%				\$ 23,136	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 23,136
		Total Consultant/Services Agreements							\$ 254,495	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 254,495
	Facilities Renovations/Construction/Outfitting												
		<i>Enrollment Construction Phase 4b - Iliia State</i>	Rate	# spaces	Sq ft	m²	Total m²						
		Laboratory 2 - Courses CompE 270, 375, 470L	\$ 1,095	1	800	74	74		\$ 81,412.64	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 81,413
		Laboratory 5 - Senior Design	\$ 1,095	1	800	74	74		\$ 81,412.64	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 81,413
		Laboratory - Hydraulics	\$ 1,095	1	1,000	93	93		\$ 101,765.80	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 101,766
		Laboratory - Structural	\$ 1,095	1	1,000	186	186		\$ 203,670.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 203,670
		Laboratory - Geotechnical	\$ 1,095	1	1,000	93	93		\$ 101,765.80	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 101,766
		Surveying Laboratory	\$ 1,095	1	200	19	19		\$ 20,353.16	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 20,353
		Computer Classroom - 2 with 30 computers	\$ 1,095	2	1,600	149	297		\$ 325,650.56	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 325,651
		Lecture Hall- Media Center with 100 seats	\$ 1,095	1	2,400	223	223		\$ 244,237.92	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 244,238
		Library Digital Media Area	\$ 1,095	1	2,400	223	223		\$ 244,237.92	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 244,238
		Laboratory Storeroom (2)	\$ 1,095	2	500	46	93		\$ 101,765.80	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 101,766
		Laboratory Technician Offices (2)	\$ 1,095	2	350	33	65		\$ 71,236.06	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 71,236
		Programs Offices (2 Engineering)	\$ 1,095	2	350	33	65		\$ 71,236.06	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 71,236

	Communal Areas (halls, stairs, HVAC plant, etc)	\$ 1,095	1	3,000	279	279	\$ 305,297.40	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 305,297
	Total Construction Phase 4b		17			1785	\$ 1,954,042	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,954,042
	<i>Enrollment Renovations Phase 5 - Tbilisi EE/Comp Engineering (\$180/m²)</i>	Rate	# spaces	Sq ft	m²	Total m²						
	Laboratory 1 Courses EE210, 330L, 430L	\$ 180	1	800	74	74	\$ 13,383	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 13,383
	Laboratory 3 Digital Communications	\$ 180	1	800	74	74	\$ 13,383	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 13,383
	Laboratory 5 Senior Design	\$ 180	1	800	74	74	\$ -	\$ 13,383	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 13,383
	Laboratory Antenna Microwave	\$ 180	1	800	74	74	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 13,383	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 13,383
	Engineering Computer Classroom - with 30 computers	\$ 180	1	1600	149	149	\$ 26,766	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 26,766
	Laboratory Storerooms	\$ 180	1	1000	93	93	\$ 16,729	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 16,729
	Laboratory Technician Offices	\$ 180	1	700	65	65	\$ 11,710	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 11,710
	Library Digital Media Area	\$ 180	1	2400	223	223	\$ 40,149	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 40,149
	Total Renovations Phase 5		8			827	\$ 108,736	\$ 13,383	\$ 26,766	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 148,885
	<i>Enrollment Renovations Phase 6 - Tbilisi Chem/Comp Sci (\$180/m²)</i>	Rate	# spaces	Sq ft	m²	Total m²						
	Chemistry 232, 432	\$ 180	1	1000	93	93	\$ 16,729	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 16,729
	Chemistry 417,427,457	\$ 180	1	1000	93	93	\$ 16,729	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 16,729
	Chemistry 457 Special	\$ 180	1	1000	93	93	\$ 16,729	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 16,729
	Chemistry 567	\$ 180	1	1000	93	93	\$ -	\$ 16,729	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 16,729
	Sciences Computer Classroom	\$ 180	1	1600	149	149	\$ 26,766	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 26,766
	Laboratory Storerooms	\$ 180	1	1000	93	93	\$ 16,729	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 16,729
	Laboratory Technician Offices	\$ 180	1	700	65	65	\$ 11,710	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 11,710
	Library Digital Media Area	\$ 180	1	2400	223	223	\$ 40,149	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 40,149
	Total Renovations Phase 6		8			901	\$ 112,082	\$ 33,457	\$ 16,729	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 162,268
	<i>Enrollment Renovations Phase 7 - Tbilisi Classrooms/Other (\$180/m²)</i>	Rate	# spaces	Sq ft	m²	Total m²						
	GE Smart Classrooms - with 30 computers	\$ 180	1	1600	149	149	\$ 26,766	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 26,766
	GE Lecture Hall- Media Center with 100 seats	\$ 180	2	2400	223	446	\$ 80,297	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 80,297
	Sciences Computer Classroom	\$ 180	1	1600	149	149	\$ 26,766	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 26,766
	Program Office	\$ 180	1	350	33	33	\$ 5,855	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,855
	General (Communal/toilet facilities)	\$ 180	2	900	84	167	\$ 30,112	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 30,112
	Total Renovations Phase 7		7			943	\$ 169,796	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 169,796
	<i>Enrollment Renovations Phase 8 - Georgia Technical Labs (\$180/m²)</i>	Rate	# spaces	Sq ft	m²	Total m²						
	Laboratory 1 Courses EE210, 330L, 430L	\$ 180	1	800	74	74	\$ 13,383	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 13,383
	Laboratory 5 Senior Design	\$ 180	1	800	74	74	\$ -	\$ 13,383	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 13,383
	Laboratory EE Power Electronics	\$ 180	1	800	74	74	\$ 13,383	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 13,383
	Laboratory Hydraulics	\$ 180	1	1000	93	93	\$ 16,729	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 16,729
	Laboratory Geotechnical	\$ 180	1	1000	93	93	\$ 16,729	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 16,729
	Surveying Laboratory	\$ 180	1	200	19	19	\$ 3,346	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,346
	Chemistry 567	\$ 180	1	1000	93	93	\$ -	\$ 16,729	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 16,729
	Laboratory Storerooms	\$ 180	2	1000	93	186	\$ 33,457	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 33,457
	Laboratory Technician Offices	\$ 180	2	700	65	130	\$ 23,420	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 23,420
	Total Renovations Phase 8		11			836	\$ 93,680	\$ 13,383	\$ 43,494	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 150,558
	<i>Enrollment Renovations Phase 9 - Georgia Classrooms/Other (\$180/m²)</i>	Rate	# spaces	Sq ft	m²	Total m²						
	Engineering Computer Classroom - with 30 computers	\$ 180	1	1600	149	149	\$ 26,766	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 26,766
	Lecture Hall- Media Center with 60 seats	\$ 180	1	1400	130	130	\$ 23,420	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 23,420
	Library Digital Media Area	\$ 180	1	2400	223	223	\$ 40,149	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 40,149
	General (Communal/toilet facilities)	\$ 180	2	900	84	167	\$ 30,112	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 30,112
	Total Renovations Phase 9		5			669	\$ 120,446	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 120,446
	Subtotal Facilities Construction/Renovations						\$ 2,558,782	\$ 60,223	\$ 86,989	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,705,993
	10% Contingency Reserve (construction/renovations)						\$ 255,878	\$ 6,022	\$ 8,699	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 270,599
	Total Facilities Construction/Renovations						\$ 2,814,660	\$ 66,245	\$ 95,688	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,976,593
	<i>Enrollment Furnishings Phase 4b - Ilia State</i>		# spaces	Furnishing	Mat'l/Equip							
	Laboratory 2 - Courses CompE 270, 375, 470L		1	\$ 20,000	\$ 136,335	material	\$ 156,335	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 156,335
			1	N/A	\$ 212,400	equipment	\$ 212,400	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 212,400
	Laboratory 5 - Senior Design		1	\$ 20,000	\$ 110,370	material	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 130,370	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 130,370
					\$ 232,200	equipment	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 232,200	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 232,200
	Laboratory - Hydraulics		1	\$ 20,000	\$ 13,500	material	\$ -	\$ 33,500	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 33,500
					\$ 464,900	equipment	\$ -	\$ 464,900	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 464,900
	Laboratory - Structural		1	\$ 20,000	\$ 54,570	material	\$ -	\$ 74,570	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 74,570
					\$ 337,400	equipment	\$ -	\$ 337,400	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 337,400
	Laboratory - Geotechnical		1	\$ 20,000	\$ 89,970	material	\$ -	\$ 109,970	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 109,970
					\$ 71,870	equipment	\$ -	\$ 71,870	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 71,870
	Surveying Laboratory		1	\$ 20,000	\$ 4,500	material	\$ 24,500	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 24,500
					\$ 36,000	equipment	\$ 36,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 36,000
	Computer Classroom - 2 with 30 computers		2	\$ 20,000	\$ 75,000		\$ 190,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 190,000
	Lecture Hall- Media Center with 100 seats		1	\$ 20,000	\$ 84,000		\$ 104,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 104,000
	Library Digital Media Area		1	\$ 50,000	\$ 9,000		\$ 59,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 59,000
	Laboratory Storeroom (2)		2	\$ 50,000	\$ 9,000		\$ 118,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 118,000

	Laboratory Technician Offices (2)	2	\$ 2,500	\$ -		\$ 5,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,000
	Programs Offices (2 Engineering)	2	\$ 2,500	\$ -		\$ 5,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,000
	Total Furnishings Phase 4b	17				\$ 910,235	\$ 1,092,210	\$ 362,570	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,365,015
	Enrollment Furnishings Phase 5 - Tbilisi EE/Comp Engineering	# spaces	Furnishing	Mat'l/Equip							
	Laboratory 1 Courses EE210, 330L, 430L	1	\$ 20,000	\$ 265,170	material	\$ 285,170	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 285,170
				\$ 77,400	equipment	\$ 77,400	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 77,400
	Laboratory 3 Digital Communications	1	\$ 20,000	\$ 102,810	material	\$ -	\$ 122,810	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 122,810
				\$ 198,000	equipment	\$ -	\$ 198,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 198,000
	Laboratory 5 Senior Design	1	\$ 20,000	\$ 265,170	material	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 285,170	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 285,170
				\$ 77,400	equipment	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 77,400	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 77,400
	Laboratory Antenna Microwave	1	\$ 20,000	\$ 67,500	material	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 87,500	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 87,500
				\$ 1,812,075	equipment	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,812,075	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,812,075
	Engineering Computer Classroom - with 30 computers	1	\$ 20,000	\$ 75,000		\$ 95,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 95,000
	Laboratory Storerooms	1	\$ 2,500	\$ -		\$ 2,500	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,500
	Laboratory Technician Offices	1	\$ 2,500	\$ -		\$ 2,500	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,500
	Library Digital Media Area	1	\$ 50,000	\$ 9,000		\$ 59,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 59,000
	Total Furnishings Phase 5	8				\$ 521,570	\$ 320,810	\$ 2,262,145	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,104,525
	Enrollment Furnishings Phase 6 - Tbilisi Chem/Comp Sci	# spaces	Furnishing	Mat'l/Equip							
	Chemistry 232, 432	1	\$ 13,500	\$ 96,000	material	\$ 109,500	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 109,500
				\$ 947,000	equipment	\$ 947,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 947,000
	Chemistry 417,427,457	1	\$ 13,500	\$ 19,000	material	\$ -	\$ 32,500	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 32,500
				\$ 260,000	equipment	\$ -	\$ 260,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 260,000
	Chemistry 457 Special	1	\$ 13,500	\$ 44,000	material	\$ -	\$ 57,500	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 57,500
				\$ 1,240,000	equipment	\$ -	\$ 1,240,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,240,000
	Chemistry 567	1	\$ 13,500	\$ 26,500	material	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 40,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 40,000
				\$ 288,000	equipment	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 288,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 288,000
	Sciences Computer Classroom	1	\$ 20,000	\$ 84,000		\$ 104,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 104,000
	Laboratory Storerooms	1	\$ 2,500	\$ -		\$ 2,500	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,500
	Laboratory Technician Offices	1	\$ 2,500	\$ -		\$ 2,500	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,500
	Library Digital Media Area	1	\$ 50,000	\$ 9,000		\$ 59,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 59,000
	Total Furnishings Phase 6	8				\$ 1,224,500	\$ 1,590,000	\$ 328,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,142,500
	Enrollment Furnishings Phase 7 - Tbilisi Classrooms/Other	# spaces	Furnishing	Mat'l/Equip							
	GE Smart Classrooms - with 30 computers	1	\$ 20,000	\$ 75,000		\$ 95,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 95,000
	GE Lecture Hall- Media Center with 100 seats	2	\$ 50,000	\$ 9,000		\$ 118,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 118,000
	Sciences Computer Classroom	1	\$ 20,000	\$ 84,000		\$ 104,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 104,000
	Program Office	1	\$ 2,500	\$ -		\$ 2,500	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,500
	General (Communal/toilet facilities)	2	\$ 2,500	\$ -		\$ 5,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,000
	Total Furnishings Phase 7	7				\$ 324,500	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 324,500
	Enrollment Furnishings Phase 8 - Georgia Technical Labs	# spaces	Furnishing	Mat'l/Equip							
	Laboratory 1 Courses EE210, 330L, 430L	1	\$ 20,000	\$ 265,170	material	\$ 285,170	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 285,170
				\$ 77,400	equipment	\$ 77,400	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 77,400
	Laboratory 5 Senior Design	1	\$ 20,000	\$ 265,170	material	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 285,170	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 285,170
				\$ 77,400	equipment	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 77,400	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 77,400
	Laboratory EE Power Electronics	1	\$ 20,000	\$ 203,835	material	\$ -	\$ 223,835	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 223,835
				\$ 212,400	equipment	\$ -	\$ 212,400	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 212,400
	Laboratory Hydraulics	1	\$ 20,000	\$ 13,500	material	\$ 33,500	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 33,500
				\$ 464,900	equipment	\$ 464,900	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 464,900
	Laboratory Geotechnical	1	\$ 20,000	\$ 89,970	material	\$ 109,970	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 109,970
				\$ 71,870	equipment	\$ 71,870	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 71,870
	Surveying Laboratory	1	\$ 20,000	\$ 4,500	material	\$ 24,500	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 24,500
				\$ 36,000	equipment	\$ 36,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 36,000
	Chemistry 567	1	\$ 13,500	\$ 26,500	material	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 40,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 40,000
				\$ 288,000	equipment	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 288,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 288,000
	Laboratory Storerooms	2	\$ 2,500	\$ -		\$ 5,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,000
	Laboratory Technician Offices	2	\$ 2,500	\$ -		\$ 5,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,000
	Total Furnishings Phase 8	11				\$ 1,113,310	\$ 436,235	\$ 690,570	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,240,115
	Enrollment Furnishings Phase 9 - Georgia Classrooms/Other	# spaces	Furnishing	Mat'l/Equip							
	Engineering Computer Classroom - with 30 computers	1	\$ 20,000	\$ 75,000		\$ 95,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 95,000
	Lecture Hall- Media Center with 60 seats	1	\$ 30,000	\$ 9,000		\$ 39,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 39,000
	Library Digital Media Area	1	\$ 50,000	\$ 9,000		\$ 59,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 59,000
	General (Communal/toilet facilities)	2	\$ 2,500	\$ -		\$ 5,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,000
	Total Furnishings Phase 9	5				\$ 198,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 198,000
	Total Furnishings					\$ 4,292,115	\$ 3,439,255	\$ 3,643,285	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 11,374,655
	Total Facilities Renovations/Construction/Outfitting					\$ 7,106,775	\$ 3,505,500	\$ 3,738,973	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 14,351,248
	Other Direct Costs	qty	Unit Cost								
	Laboratory Software	22	\$ 2,500			\$ 17,500	\$ 27,500	\$ 10,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 55,000
	Laboratory Supplies					\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Library resources	3	\$ 25,000			\$ 75,000					\$ 75,000
	Eyewash Stations	10	\$ 275			\$ 550	\$ 1,100	\$ 1,100	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,750

		Total Other Direct Costs								\$ 93,050	\$ 28,600	\$ 11,100	\$ -	\$ 132,750
		Subtotal Task 7: Direct Costs								\$ 7,571,780	\$ 3,664,958	\$ 3,816,126	\$ -	\$ 15,052,864
		Indirect Costs (MTDC)	26%							\$ 736,879	\$ 211,677	\$ 245,794	\$ -	\$ 1,194,351
		Grand Total Task 7: Facilities Development								\$ 8,308,659	\$ 3,876,636	\$ 4,061,920	\$ -	\$ 16,247,215
SUMMARY														
	Staffing	Labor, Fringe Benefits, LOE								\$ 378,846	\$ 474,487	\$ 360,039	\$ 212,902	\$ 1,426,274
	Travel	R/T Airfare, Per Diem, \$1000 Misc., Stipends, etc.								\$ 289,621	\$ 289,621	\$ 244,221	\$ 188,940	\$ 1,012,403
		Consultants/Services Agreements								\$ 357,495	\$ 90,000	\$ 90,000	\$ 78,000	\$ 615,495
		Facilities Construction/Renovations including 10% reserve								\$ 2,814,660	\$ 66,245	\$ 95,688	\$ -	\$ 2,976,593
		Facilities Outfitting								\$ 4,292,115	\$ 3,439,255	\$ 3,643,285	\$ -	\$ 11,374,655
		Other Direct Costs								\$ 128,650	\$ 45,700	\$ 28,200	\$ 17,100	\$ 219,650
		Total Direct Costs								\$ 8,261,387	\$ 4,405,308	\$ 4,461,433	\$ 496,942	\$ 17,625,070
		Indirect Costs (MTDC)	26%							\$ 911,367	\$ 404,168	\$ 413,574	\$ 129,205	\$ 1,858,314
		TOTAL DELIVERY ORDER:								\$ 9,172,754	\$ 4,809,476	\$ 4,875,007	\$ 626,147	\$ 19,483,384

SDSU-Georgia – Pre-Enrollment Contract 15-Month Work Plan (Tasks, Timelines, Deliverables, Payments)

This document represents the work plan for the execution of the Scope of Services as defined in Appendix A to the Pre-Enrollment Contract and includes a detailed breakout of the key milestones, deliverables, reports, invoicing and associated schedules as specified in Appendix B. Both Appendices are attached to this document for ease of reference.

This Work Plan is a companion to and structured to align with the Pre-Enrollment Contract Work Plan Events Schedule. There are two major sections: 1) the Pre-enrollment Contract reporting requirements to include the startup inception report and five quarterly progress reports to include the periodic progress payments (invoices by task) per the approved budget and scope of services and 2) a more detailed breakout for each of the seven tasks into key subtask activities.

Section I. Reporting and Invoicing

As per the Pre-Enrollment Contract terms and conditions, there are six primary reports (Deliverables) to be provided throughout the execution of the Pre-Enrollment Contract. Appendix B to the contract identifies the key reporting requirements to be included in the Inception Report and the five Quarterly Progress Reports. The Work Plan Events Schedule, also, provides a timeline for the submission of these reports as a key activity and lists the reporting requirements. These requirements will not be repeated here; however, it should be noted that additional reports, such as Terms of Reference (TOR), Environmental and Social Impact Plans, Partner MOUs, GRDF guidelines, etc. are incorporated in the Quarterly Reports or will be provided as needed. For a more complete definition of the requirements, refer to Appendices A and B, and the Work Plan Events Schedule.

Also, as with the reporting, six (6) invoices will be submitted as specified in Appendix B and listed in the Events Schedule document. These invoices shall be submitted with the Inception and Quarterly Progress Reports.

The following table provides a schedule for the Inception and Quarterly reports and a breakdown of the 6 invoices, the lump sum payment percentage applied on a Task basis, and the invoice total payment requested.

Key Event	Invoice No.	Invoice Date	Lump Sum % of Contract	Task 1 Budget	Task 2 Budget	Task 3 Budget	Task 4 Budget	Task 5 Budget	Task 6 Budget	Task 7 Budget	Totals by Invoice
Inception Report	INV 1	15-Aug-14	18%	\$ 588,108	\$ 19,741	\$ 56,937	\$ 160,088	\$ 73,954	\$ 139,349	\$ 578,924	\$1,617,101
Quarter 1 Progress Report	INV 2	15-Oct-14	17%	\$ 555,435	\$ 18,645	\$ 53,774	\$ 151,194	\$ 69,845	\$ 131,607	\$ 546,762	\$1,527,262
Quarter 2 Progress Report	INV 3	15-Jan-15	20%	\$ 653,453	\$ 21,935	\$ 63,263	\$ 177,876	\$ 82,171	\$ 154,832	\$ 643,249	\$1,796,779
Quarter 3 Progress Report	INV 4	15-Apr-15	20%	\$ 653,453	\$ 21,935	\$ 63,263	\$ 177,876	\$ 82,171	\$ 154,832	\$ 643,249	\$1,796,779
Quarter 4 Progress Report	INV 5	15-Jul-15	12.5%	\$ 408,408	\$ 13,709	\$ 39,540	\$ 111,172	\$ 51,357	\$ 96,770	\$ 402,031	\$1,122,987
Quarter 5 Progress Report	INV 6	15-Oct-15	12.5%	\$ 408,408	\$ 13,709	\$ 39,540	\$ 111,172	\$ 51,357	\$ 96,770	\$ 402,031	\$1,122,987
			Totals by Task	\$3,267,265	\$ 109,674	\$ 316,316	\$ 889,379	\$ 410,855	\$ 774,160	\$3,216,245	\$8,983,894

Section II. Pre-Enrollment Contract Work Plan

The Scope of Services as defined in Appendix A to the Pre-Enrollment Contract specifies 7 primary tasks and several “Other Services” to be performed throughout the 15-month contract. Within each task, there are subtasks (key activities) to include resourcing that are essential to the attainment of the overall program objectives. The following subsections will define these tasks in the context of the quarterly performance and, the time period, key players, milestones (as applicable), and deliverables. The details align with Appendices A and B, the 15-month budget, and the

Task 1. Business Unit Organization, Startup, and Operations -- \$3,267,265

The primary purpose of Task 1 is to establish and maintain the management team, program office, and administrative and operational programs and processes to achieve the objectives of the STEM Higher Education Project in accordance with the Pre-Enrollment Contract. Beginning with the preparation and submission of the Inception Report, the remaining subtasks are focused primarily on the engagement of key personnel at SDSU, the SDSU-Georgia program office and Partner Institutions; securing professional consulting support services; overseeing the activities of Tasks 2 through 7 in collaboration with Partners; and administration of the program to include periodic assessments, reporting of metrics versus plans, and applying lessons learned.

The following sections define the work plan for Task 1 by Subtasks to include a Subtask Timeline, the major Participants, Key Milestones, and Deliverables

Subtask 1.1 Start-up and Inception Activities and Report

Start/End	Award - Award plus 18 days
Participants	SDSU, MCA-Georgia, Partner Institutions
Key Milestone	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Establish senior management operations; includes Interim Dean (Ken Walsh), Budgets/Contracts Support (Janov), Project Start-up Coordinator (Crockett), SDSU Campus Program CoordinationPrepare the Inception Report with key attachments
Deliverables	Inception Report due on August 15, 2014 Invoice #1 for the Pre-Enrollment Contract - \$1,617,101 for all tasks

SDSU will deliver to MCA-Georgia a Pre-Enrollment Contract Inception Report and invoice not to exceed 18% of the approved Pre-Enrollment Contract budget. Key elements of the Inception Report include:

- Mobilization and Business Startup status report (Report on key staffing and consulting services)
- Updated work plan for the Pre-Enrollment Contract, including renovations/construction schedule (Work plan is defined in Sections II through IV of this document)
- Updated 5-year draft budget (Note: includes 15-month Pre-Enrollment and 45 month follow-on)
- Updated list of academic/laboratory equipment (note: equipment is defined as having a cost of \$5,000 or more plus a useful life of 1-year or more)
- Comparative analysis map of SDSU environmental/social impact requirements to the IFC Performance Standard I
- Draft agreements with Partner Universities

Subtask 1.2 Staffing Plan

Start/End	Award - Award plus 450 days
Participants	SDSU, MCA-Georgia, Partner Institutions
Key Milestones	Incremental hiring plan on an as and when needed basis of key management and support staff for Business Operations
Deliverables	Include status in Quarterly Progress Reports 1, 2 and 3

Program personnel will be an appropriate combination of US-based and Georgian staff. These personnel will have primary responsibility for representing the requirements of SDSU faculty for the program to all groups and persons external to SDSU, particularly to the Government of Georgia, institutional partners, MCA-Georgia, MCC, and industry partners. The personnel will be responsible

for the administration and efficient conduct of the Pre-Enrollment Contract Scope of Services to include development of the educational program, and for integrating the plans of the program with those of SDSU and the Partner Institutions. Personnel will enforce the policies and regulations adopted by the Board of Trustees, the Office of the SDSU President, the SDSU Faculty Senate, and SDSU faculty, and the terms and conditions of the Pre-Enrollment Contract. Personnel will be responsible for the academic, personnel, financial, and administrative affairs of the program and for communicating the vision and goals of SDSU-Georgia to community and professional constituencies and seeking public and private funds to support the goals of the program.

Subtask 1.3 Contract Signing and Kick-off Event

Start/End	Award
Participants	SDSU, MCA-Georgia, MCC, GoG, Partner Institutions
Key Milestone	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Execution of MOU with the Government of Georgia • Execution of 15-month Pre-Enrollment Contract with MCA-Georgia • Conduct Public Relations Event and Community/Student Outreach
Deliverables	Include results in Inception Report

Coincident with the signing of the Memorandum of Understanding with the Government of Georgia and the Pre-Enrollment Contract with MCA-Georgia, SDSU-Georgia and the Partner Institutions will host a kick-off (open-house) event to introduce this higher education initiative and provide information about the SDSU degree programs to the community and in particular potential students.

Subtask 1.4 Consulting/Services Agreements

Start/End	Award plus 15 to award plus 60
Partners	SDSU, Legal/Business Services, HR Support/Temp Services
Key Milestone	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legal/Import-Export Services • Business Operations/Human Resources Services
Deliverables	Include in Quarterly Progress Report 1

To ensure compliance with Georgian and international laws and regulations, SDSU intends to solicit and engage consulting support services in support of business, financial, personnel, and other matters. These services' agreements will be established within the first 60 days and cover up to the entire Pre-Enrollment period of performance.

Subtask 1.5 GE Staff Training and Indoctrination at SDSU

Start/End	Award plus 30 to Award plus 270
Partners	SDSU, Partner Institutions
Key Milestone	Staff Hiring August 2014, October 2014, January 2015, April 2015
Deliverables	Include in Quarterly Progress Reports 1, 2, 3 and 4

Staff personnel to be hired in Georgia to perform duties such as external relations, procurement, finance and accounting, faculty/student affairs, student admissions, facilities, and IT support services will be provided indoctrination and training at SDSU, as applicable, within the first 3 months of engagement to become familiar with SDSU policies, procedures, on-line and database programs, and other matters to facility their ability to perform the duties more efficiently and effectively as required.

Subtask 1.6 Convene the Advisory Board

Start/End	Award plus 60 to award plus 75
Participants	SDSU, MCA-Georgia, Partner Institutions, Industry, others (TBD)
Key Milestone	Recruit members for the Advisory Board Conduct initial Advisory Board Meeting
Deliverables	Include status in Quarterly Progress Report 1

SDSU-Georgia will organize an Advisory Board, consisting of representatives from MCA-Georgia, the Partner Institutions, industry, and other organizations, as may be applicable, to provide advice to SDSU-Georgia on matters of curriculum, workforce needs, and student recruitment with particular attention to social and gender equity issues. The Board will be convened semi-annually with the inaugural meeting to be completed in Quarter 1.

Subtask 1.7 Procurement of Office Equipment

Start/End	Award plus 60 – Award plus 120
Participants	SDSU, MCA-Georgia, TSU
Key Milestone	Staff hiring and availability of Executive/Administration Offices at MCA-Georgia Building and TSU
Deliverables	Include in Quarterly Progress Reports 1 and 2

Office equipment (computers, copiers, and communications systems) will be procured incrementally as the staff is hired and the facilities at TSU and MCA-Georgia become available.

Subtask 1.8 – Quarterly Task 1 Performance Assessments

Start/End	Award plus 16 – Award plus 450
Participants	SDSU, MCA-Georgia, Partner Institutions
Key Milestone	Continued management of institutional objectives Assessment of Performance against plan and metrics Update Work Plan for Task 1
Deliverables	Include in all Quarterly Progress Reports

As part of the quarterly progress reports, an assessment of the Task activities is to be provided along with any required modifications to the work plan or schedule for that Task. Any problems, issues, lessons learned, performance data, etc. will be included, as applicable.

Subtask 1.9 – Follow-on Contract Budget and Work Plan

Start/End	Award plus 360 – Award plus 450
Participants	SDSU, MCA-Georgia, Partner Institutions
Key Milestone	Prepare draft Budget and Work Plan – July 2015 Prepare Final Budget and Work Plan – October 2015
Deliverables	Include with Quarterly Progress Reports 4 and 5

SDSU will submit a draft detailed budget and Work Plan on July 1, 2015 and work with MCA-Georgia to prepare a final version no later than the end of the Pre-Enrollment Contract for the follow-on contract.

Task 2. Accreditation – SDSU Degrees -- \$109,674

Of key importance is to establish the degree programs as valid selections under the national university system. This will be done in 2 stages. Stage 1 will be in Quarter 1 for the Electrical Engineering, Computer Engineering, and Chemistry degree programs to be offered starting in October 2015. Phase 2 will be done in Quarter 5 for Computer Science, Civil Engineering, and Construction Engineering degree programs to be offered in October 2016. Upon award, SDSU-Georgia will leverage existing academic collaborators at the partner institutions, as well as the program design and accreditation as articulated in the proposal. After initial accreditation of SDSU-Georgia programs, SDSU will monitor and maintain institutional accreditation as required.

Concurrently, SDSU will obtain WASC accreditation for the delivery of its accredited degree programs off campus and submit the application for accreditation of its Computer Sciences Degree program. [Note: The Accrediting Commission for Schools, Western Association of Schools and Colleges (ACS WASC) is one of six regional accrediting associations in the United States. Through the formal accreditation program, the public is assured that accredited institutions are evaluated extensively and conform to general expectations of performance and quality. Moreover, students can be assured that the institutions in which they seek to enroll have been reviewed and the educational programs that are offered have been evaluated for quality. Educational institutions benefit from the stimulus for self-study and self-improvement provided by the accreditation process.

Subtask 2.1 –Staffing Plan

Start/End	Award plus 15 - Award plus 90 days and Award plus 360 – Award plus 450
Participants	SDSU Colleges of Arts & Letters, Engineering, and Sciences; SDSU-Georgia; MCA-Georgia; Partner Institutions
Key Milestones	Assemble Accreditation Team at SDSU (Stage 1 and Stage 2) Engage Partner Institutions Support Staff (Stage 1 and Stage 2)
Deliverables	Include status in Quarterly Progress Reports 1 and 5

SDSU will assemble representatives from its Colleges of Engineering, Sciences, and Arts & Letters to assemble the degree program materials required for translation into Georgian and submission to the Government of Georgia for approval and listing in the national university system as a valid degree program for Georgian students to select for the academic years starting in October 2015 and 2016. Concurrently, SDSU-Georgia will retain the services of the Partner Institutions to assist in the translation, preparation, and submission of the accreditation packages no later than September 1, 2014 and 2015.

Subtask 2.2 – Assemble Accreditation Materials

Start/End	Award plus 15 - Award plus 45 days and Award plus 360 – Award plus 390
Participants	SDSU Colleges of Arts & Letters, Engineering, and Sciences;
Key Milestones	Assemble Degree Program materials – Electrical Engineering, Computer Engineering, and Chemistry (Biotech) – Stage 1 Assemble Degree Program Materials – Civil & Construction Engineering, Computer Science – Stage 2
Deliverables	Include status in Quarterly Progress Reports 1 and 5

The Accreditation Team at SDSU will assemble the curricula and course materials for each of the three degree programs to be offered starting in October 2015. These materials will be translated into Georgian along with other required documents to be submitted to the Government of Georgia in early September 2014 for review and approval for listing in the national university system.

Subtask 2.3 – Consulting/Services Agreements

Start/End	Award plus 15 – Award plus 60 and Award plus 360 – Award 420
Participants	SDSU, Consultants, Partner Institutions
Key Milestone	Execution of Agreements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accreditation Consultant Stages 1 and 2 • Translation Services Stages 1 and 2
Deliverables	Include status in Quarterly Progress Reports 1 and 5

Consulting/Service Agreements will be secured to support translation of SDSU degree program materials and for coordination of the preparation and submission of the accreditation packages. The Institutional Partners, however, may be engaged in this capacity since they will be submitting the packages on behalf of SDSU-Georgia.

Subtask 2.4 – Applications Preparation and Submission

Start/End	Award 15 – Award plus 45 and Award plus 360 – Award 420
Participants	SDSU, Partner Institutions, Consultants
Key Milestone	Partner Institutions submit accreditation applications – September 1, 2014 Partner Institutions submit accreditation applications – September 1, 2015
Deliverables	Include status in Quarterly Progress Reports 1 and 5

SDSU-Georgia with the Partner Institutions shall prepare the accreditation applications packages for the three degree programs for submission to meet the Georgian Education Quality Enhancement (EQE) Center's September 2014 deadline.

Subtask 2.5 – Quarterly Task 2 Performance Assessments

Start/End	Award plus 16 – Award plus 90 and Award plus 360 – Award plus 450
Participants	SDSU, MCA-Georgia, Partner Institutions
Key Milestone	Continued management of institutional objectives Assessment of Performance against plan and metrics Update Work Plan for Task 2
Deliverables	Include in Quarterly Progress Report 1 (update in other reports, if applicable)

As part of the quarterly progress reports, an assessment of the Task activities is to be provided along with any required modifications to the work plan or schedule for that Task. Any problems, issues, lessons learned, performance data, etc. will be included, as applicable.

Task 3. Articulation – Partner Courses -- \$316,316

A major approach for accelerating the ABET accreditation process for undergraduate degree programs offered at the Partner Institutions is to identify, modify (where needed), and accept for credit existing courses at these institutions that meet the ABET certification requirements of the SDSU-Georgia degree programs. An evaluation and articulation assessment program will be developed and supported directly at SDSU. The first three months will represent the Phase I of a

multi-phase process to identify, evaluate and submit for approval appropriate partner institution courses. Phase I will target primarily courses for General Education requirements. Additional courses (2 per Partner per Quarter) will be identified and submitted to SDSU for assessment under this Articulation initiative.

Subtask 3.1 – Staffing Plan

Start/End	Award plus 30
Participants	SDSU, MCA-Georgia, Partner Universities
Key Milestone	Formation of Articulation team – 1 faculty per program +Gen Ed Engage representatives from Partner Institutions
Deliverables	Include status in Quarterly Progress Report 1

SDSU will assemble representatives from its Colleges of Engineering, Sciences, and Arts & Letters to conduct the assessment of Partner Institutions' courses and determination of a course's eligibility for articulation with or without modifications

Subtask 3.2 – Develop and Execute Articulation Plan

Start/End	Award plus 30 to Award plus 450
Participants	SDSU, Partner Universities
Key Milestone	Execute a phased articulation plan for Partner Universities' courses <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Phase 1 Partner GE Courses articulation pilot – Quarters 1 and 2 • Phase 2 Implement sustained articulation program – Quarters 2 thru 5
Deliverables	Include status in all Quarterly Progress Reports

SDSU faculty will collaborate with counterparts at the Partner Universities. The initial set of courses will be in the General Education disciplines as a pilot test case to refine the process. Additional courses will be submitted for evaluation quarterly – 2 per Partner per quarter.

Subtask 3.3 – Consulting/Services Agreements

Start/End	Award plus 30 – Award plus 450
Participants	SDSU, Consultants, Partner Institutions
Key Milestone	Execution of Agreements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Translation Services – A-60 (May be performed by Partner Institutions) • Curriculum Development – A-120 (Collaborative course development) • ABET Accreditation of Articulated Courses – A-180
Deliverables	Include status in all Quarterly Progress Reports

Consulting/Service Agreements will be secured to support translation of SDSU degree program materials and for coordination of the preparation and submission of the accreditation packages. The Institutional Partners, however, may be engaged in this capacity since they will be submitting the packages on behalf of SDSU-Georgia.

Subtask 3.4 – Quarterly Task 3 Performance Assessments

Start/End	Award plus 16 – Award plus 450
Participants	SDSU, MCA-Georgia, Partner Institutions

Key Milestone	Continued management of institutional objectives Assessment of Performance against plan and metrics Update Work Plan for Task 3
Deliverables	Include status in all Quarterly Progress Reports

As part of the quarterly progress reports, an assessment of the Task activities is to be provided along with any required modifications to the work plan or schedule for that Task. Any problems, issues, lessons learned, performance data, etc. will be included, as applicable.

Task 4. English/STEM Institute -- \$889,379

Necessary to facilitate the objective of building opportunity for students from underrepresented groups, SDSU-Georgia collaborative will provide a multi-track, intensive English Language program designed to provide remediation, supplemental support, and general English Language education in preparation for enrollment in SDSU-Georgia degree programs. STEM courses in mathematics and sciences will be added as the need is verified through student assessment examinations. However, SDSU is perfectly positioned to rapidly launch the English program based on our extensive experience training non-native English speakers in our campus-based Language Acquisition Resource Center (LARC)/American Language Institute (ALI).

Subtask 4.1 – Staffing

Start/End	Award plus 30 – Award plus 450
Participants	SDSU, MCA-Georgia
Key Milestone	Identification and engagement of the English/STEM Institute Director, graduate-student instruction team, assistant director, and QA administrator
Deliverables	Include status in Quarterly Progress Report 1

SDSU will engage a full-time Director to set-up and manage the operations of the Institute with a target of enrolling students, target 75, and offering the initial courses in October 2014. A faculty and graduate student team of up to 4 individuals will provide the training. In addition, a Georgian will be hired to serve as an assistant director and a SDSU faculty will provide oversight and Quality Assurance of the Institute programs and operations.

Subtask 4.2 – English/STEM Strategy and Execution Plan

Start/End	Award plus 30 to Award plus 90
Participants	SDSU, Partner Universities, Consultant
Key Milestone	Development of recruitment, testing, assessment strategy Development of a Schedule and Delivery Plan
Deliverables	Include in Quarterly Progress Report 1

The Institute Director with support from the SDSU main campus and SDSU-Georgia staff will develop a strategy and plan based on the results of recruiting and student assessments. It is envisioned that a multi-stage program will offer three 10-week sessions of multiple courses and sections to accommodate students of different English Language skill levels.

Subtask 4.3 – Consulting/Services Agreements

Start/End	Award plus 30 – Award plus 450
Participants	SDSU, Consultants, Partner Institutions

Key Milestone	Execution of Agreement(s) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student recruitment (target of 25% women/socially vulnerable) • Student Assessments, testing, and placement
Deliverables	Include status in all Quarterly Progress Reports

Consulting/Service Agreements will be secured to support program marketing and student recruitment, testing, and assessment to determine their English Language skill levels in listening, speaking, reading, and writing. English Placement tests will be used to further identify the scope of training required. Student outreach will continue throughout the 15-month contract with a focus on socially disadvantaged groups.

Subtask 4.4 – Student Recruitment, Assessment and Enrollment

Start/End	Award plus 45 to award plus 450
Participants	SDSU, Partner Universities, Consultant
Key Milestone	Initial target enrollment of up to 75 students in an English language Program
Deliverables	Include status in all Quarterly Progress Reports

The English Language Program is a multi-track program designed to rapidly improve language ability for matriculation into SDSU-Georgia degree programs. Testing and student assessments will be performed to determine skill levels for placement in an appropriate program. We anticipate multiple sections being offered in parallel, allowing students with differing abilities to enter the institute at an appropriate level.

Subtask 4.5 – English/STEM Training Program

Start/End	Award plus 90 to Award plus 360
Participants	SDSU, SDSU-Georgia, Tbilisi State University
Key Milestone	Delivery of three (3) 10-week intensive training sessions
Deliverables	Include status in Quarterly Progress Report 2, 3, 4

English Language courses will be offered as 10-week (by quarter) intensive sessions. Student learning outcomes are stated on each course syllabus and these outcomes are measured through a number of writing assignments (on average 4 papers) throughout the course. If one course has multiple sections, following the same syllabus, each section targets the same outcomes and measures the outcomes the same way. Different sections/sessions may be offered for groups of students having similar skill levels. Class sizes are limited to no more than 25 students. Training consists of both in-class sessions and on-line programs. Note: As the Institute program becomes more established, STEM courses may be added and taught in English, where appropriate, to further the overall readiness-level for students to qualify and succeed in a degree program.

Subtask 4.6 – Degree Programs Readiness Assessment

Start/End	Award plus 360 to award plus 450
Participants	SDSU, MCA-Georgia, Partner Universities, Consultant
Key Milestone	Completion and assessment of students upon completion of training sessions
Deliverables	Include in Quarterly Progress Reports 2, 3, 4, 5

As students complete the English Language training program, they will be tested to determine their skill level and qualification for enrollment in one of the SDSU-Georgia degree programs. Tests may

include one or more of the following: CAST, EPT, WPA, Mathematics, and/or Chemistry Placement assessments.

Subtask 4.7 – Quarterly Task 4 Performance Assessments

Start/End	Award plus 16 – Award plus 450
Participants	SDSU, MCA-Georgia, Partner Institutions
Key Milestone	Continued management of institutional objectives Assessment of Performance against plan and metrics Update Work Plan for Task 4
Deliverables	Include status in all Quarterly Progress Reports

As part of the quarterly progress reports, an assessment of the Task activities is to be provided along with any required modifications to the work plan or schedule for that Task. Any problems, issues, lessons learned, performance data, etc. will be included, as applicable.

Task 5. Degree Programs Student Recruiting -- \$410,855

The primary student recruitment strategy will be to leverage the existing national university system of the Government of Georgia. With successful completion of Task 2, a critical component of the start-up process, SDSU-Georgia degree programs will be accredited and certified at each partner institution. The programs will be listed along with the other national university selections available to students as choices pending their national examination results. However, listing the programs in the national system will not be sufficient to stimulate selection of SDSU-Georgia programs. To mitigate this concern and to extend the reach of the program to students from socially-disadvantaged groups, SDSU-Georgia will implement an outreach initiative directly to high school students starting their senior year in 2014 with a multi-faceted message concerning the SDSU-Georgia programs. Among the key messages will be:

- Description of the degree programs and qualification requirements
- Relationship between SDSU and the Partner Universities
- Value of an internationally-recognized degree
- Cost of the program and availability of scholarships and student aid

Subtask 5.1 – Staffing

Start/End	Award plus 30 – Award plus 210
Participants	SDSU, Partner Institutions
Key Milestone	Engagement of three Assist Directors of Student/Faculty Affairs to be located at the Partner Institutions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One at Award plus 60 for TSU and two at Award plus 120 for GTU and ISU Engagement of three Assist Directors of Admissions fairs to be located at the Partner Institutions. All 3 to be engaged by Award plus 210
Deliverables	Include status in Quarterly Progress Reports 1, 2, 4

SDSU-Georgia, in Task 1, will engage a full-time Director for Faculty/Student Affairs by October 2014 and Director for Admissions by January 2015 to coordinate these activities with support from the assistant directors to be hired and located at each of the three Partner Institutions. Collectively, this staff will carry out the student recruitment strategy and subsequent enrollment of qualified students in one of the SDSU degree programs.

Subtask 5.2 – Student Recruitment Strategy and Execution Plan

Start/End	Award plus 30 to Award plus 90
Participants	SDSU, Partner Universities, Consultant
Key Milestone	Development of student recruitment strategy Development of student outreach and Enrollment Plan
Deliverables	Include status in Quarterly Progress Report 1

SDSU-Georgia with consulting support will develop a recruitment strategy and plan to be implemented in Quarter 2. The key objectives are to 1) target gender/socially vulnerable populations, 2) encourage current seniors to select one of the SDSU degree programs in their application to GoG for the merit scholarship, and 3) use this recruitment strategy as a means for further identifying students for the English/STEM Institute. Based on preliminary discussions with government and university officials, we plan to implement a pilot program during the Pre-Enrollment Contract. This pilot program will involve targeted recruitment from Batumi State University and Kutaisi State University, placement tests for English and mathematics and special support program through faculty and peer advising. This pilot program will emphasize culturally appropriate services with advice from partner universities. One component of the pilot program will be the review of national examination scores that do not meet the minimum criteria for admission to the national university system. Although in some cases, these scores may simply be due to under-performing students, it is possible that the group of students not scoring well enough for automatic admission may be over-represented by socially disadvantaged students and as such would be appropriate candidates for the English/STEM Institute. The goal is to achieve a cohort of 500 students enrolled at SDSU-Georgia in October 2015.

Subtask 5.3 – Consulting/Services Agreements

Start/End	Award plus 30 – Award plus 450
Participants	SDSU, Consultants, Partner Institutions
Key Milestone	Execution of Agreement(s) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• SDSU-Georgia Degree Program marketing program• Student recruitment (target of 25% women/socially vulnerable)• Student Assessments, testing, and placement, as applicable
Deliverables	Include status in all Quarterly Progress Reports

Consulting/Service Agreement(s) will be secured to support SDSU-Georgia degree programs marketing and student recruitment. This effort will be performed in consort with and in support of the English/ STEM Institute program. Student outreach will continue throughout the 15-month contract with a focus socially disadvantaged groups

Subtask 5.4 – Recruitment/Enrollment Activities

Start/End	Award plus 90 to award plus 450
Participants	SDSU, Partner Universities, Consultant
Key Milestone	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Marketing/Recruitment Plan Execution• Student Assessment/Testing (500*)• Evaluation of Gender/Socially Vulnerable for Scholarships/Aid• Student Registration – Target 500 (25% G/SV)
Deliverables	Include status in all Quarterly Progress Reports

The SDSU-Georgia opportunity will be introduced to the incoming Fall 2014 high school senior class. The opportunity and value proposition will be presented, along with an opportunity to take the English language evaluation and participate in the English Language Institute in anticipation of transferring to the SDSU-Georgia degree program in October 2015. Recruitment and admissions will be managed centrally, by the SDSU-Georgia Director of Admissions, supported by both the centralized Admissions Assistant and Student Affairs Assistant, and facilitated at each campus by the resident Director of Student/Faculty Affairs. Although recruitment and admissions will be managed locally, records and transcripts will continue to be held by SDSU's Office of Admissions and Records on the main campus.

Subtask 5.5 – Quarterly Task 5 Performance Assessments

Start/End	Award plus 30 – Award plus 450
Participants	SDSU, MCA-Georgia, Partner Institutions
Key Milestone	Continued management of recruitment objectives Assessment of Performance against plan and metrics Update Work Plan for Task 5
Deliverables	Include status in all Quarterly Progress Reports

As part of the quarterly progress reports, an assessment of the Task activities is to be provided along with any required modifications to the work plan or schedule for that Task. Any problems, issues, lessons learned, performance data, etc. will be included, as applicable.

Task 6. GE Faculty Recruiting/Training -- \$774,160

Partner institution senior faculty will participate in orientation at SDSU prior to development of the teaching corps for the accredited collaborative courses. The SDSU orientation will be done over a summer session, and will be targeted at senior academic and administrative staff (department chair and above) to establish a secure contact point for future recruitment of teaching faculty, as required by the objectives of the program. [Note: SDSU-Georgia will pay for travel including per diem and a stipend; and the Partner Institution will cover their faculty's salary during the orientation period. Orientation topics will follow the outline proposed, but may also include areas of particular interest to the Partner Institution leadership. Additional training sessions will be conducted each semester with target of training up to 30 faculty during the Pre-Enrollment Contract.

Subtask 6.1 – Staffing

Start/End	Award – Award plus 360
Participants	SDSU, Partner Institutions
Key Milestone	Engagement of three Assist Directors of Student/Faculty Affairs to be located at the Partner Institutions (Note: refer to Subtask 5.1) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> One at Award plus 60 for TSU and two at Award plus 120 for GTU and ISU Engage SDSU Faculty Mentors/Trainers (4 – 1 per program plus 1 GE)
Deliverables	Include status in Quarterly Progress Reports 1, 2, 3, 4

SDSU will engage faculty on its main campus to serve as mentors/trainers for visiting faculty from the Partner Institutions. There will be one SDSU faculty assigned for each of the degree programs and one for the general education courses. Plan is to have a ratio of one SDSU faculty for three Georgian faculty. Note: The Assistant Directors of Student/Faculty Affairs in Georgia are 50% time on Task 4

and 50% time on Task 5 and will serve as the coordinators in Georgia for faculty recruitment for the training program.

Subtask 6.2 – GE Faculty Training

Start/End	Award – Award plus 450
Participants	SDSU, Partner Institutions
Key Milestone	An indoctrination training session will be conducted in Quarter 1 with three additional training sessions during the Fall Semester 2014, Spring Semester 2015, an Summer Session 2015. Target enrollment of participating faculty: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summer Session 2014 – Target 8 • Fall Semester 2014 – Target 12 • Spring Semester 2015 – Target 12 • Summer Session 2015 – Target 6
Deliverables	Include status in all Quarterly Progress Reports

Selected Georgian faculty members will be hosted at SDSU to gain experience with teaching approaches used at SDSU and to integrate SDSU curricula into their own instruction. SDSU faculty will continue to co-teach courses through in-person instruction, intensive instruction hybrid courses, or online approaches until the collaborative faculties of both SDSU and the host institution agree that the curriculum is sufficiently robust for independent ABET/ACS accreditation. During these visits to SDSU, Georgian faculty will live on campus and work closely with SDSU faculty to gain experience in teaching and assessing the course according to ABET standards, including training on use of the equipment and software to be purchased for the Georgian partner institution.

Subtask 6.3 – Quarterly Task 6 Performance Assessments

Start/End	Award plus 30 – Award plus 450
Participants	SDSU, MCA-Georgia, Partner Institutions
Key Milestone	Continued management of recruitment objectives Assessment of Performance against plan and metrics Update Work Plan for Task 6
Deliverables	Include status in all Quarterly Progress Reports

As part of the quarterly progress reports, an assessment of the Task activities is to be provided along with any required modifications to the work plan or schedule for that Task. Any problems, issues, lessons learned, performance data, etc. will be included, as applicable.

Task 7. Facilities Development -- \$3,216,245 (does not include \$532,723 retained by MCA-Georgia for renovations)

SDSU, SDSU-Georgia, MCA-Georgia, and the Partner Institutions will collaborate on the development of facilities to support the delivery of courses and the overall administration of the program. For the Pre-Enrollment Contract, the plan is to renovate spaces to support the Dean and administrative staff, the English/STEM program, General Education classrooms, laboratories, and other facilities, and preparation of the construction bid package for the new building at ISU to be started in October 2015. MCA-Georgia is responsible for all renovation and construction. SDSU is responsible for design, preparation of bid specifications, and for construction oversight, management, and endorsement of payment approvals.

Subtask 7.1 – Staffing

Start/End	Award plus 30 – Award plus 450
Participants	SDSU, MCA-Georgia, Partner Institutions, Consultants
Key Milestone	Identification and engagement of the SDSU campus designated “Facilities Coordinators” to support planned renovations for the English/STEM institute for the Pre-Enrollment Contract training and the Degree Programs’ General Education classes and laboratories needed in October 2015
Deliverables	Include status in Quarterly Progress Report 1

Identification and engagement of the SDSU campus designated “Facilities Coordinators” to support planned renovations for the English/STEM institute for the Pre-Enrollment Contract training and the Degree Programs’ General Education classes and laboratories needed to support commencement of degree programs in October 2015. The coordinators will serve as advisors to the MCA-Georgia team on the facility requirements, equipment and furnishings, general layout, and final acceptance. The SDSU-Georgia team will include a Construction/Renovation Manager (refer to Task 1) who will work directly for the Dean and with the selected Design Services and Construction Management Consultant (Subtask 7.2) to ensure that all renovations/construction is performed in compliance with required regulations pertaining to environmental, health and safety, and social impact requirements.

Subtask 7.2 – Consulting/Services Agreements

Start/End	Award plus 30 to award plus 450
Participants	SDSU, MCA-Georgia
Key Milestone	Establish Design and Construction Supervision Consulting Agreement <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Development and approval of the Terms of Reference• Conduct Request for bids and selection Establish Architectural Firm Consulting Agreements (Note: may be performed by the Design Services Consultant) as and when required for the separate packages
Deliverables	Include status in Quarterly Progress Report

There are five (5) phases of renovations/construction planned for the Pre-Enrollment Contract. Each phase will involve the development of design specifications, drawings, bid packages, etc. and the conduct of the RFPs. It is intended to engage competitively following the SDSU procurement policies and procedures a qualified Design Construction firm to handle the design services and construction management. Either the firm or SDSU-Georgia with support from the SDSU Research Foundation will engage Architectural and other professionals as required to develop the required plans and documents.

Subtask 7.3 – Renovations/Construction Planning

Start/End	Award plus 30 to award plus 90
Participants	SDSU, MCA-Georgia,
Key Milestone	Development of Environmental and Social Impact Framework that meets or exceeds the IFC Performance Standards <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Health & Safety and Social Impact Plans• TOR for Renovations Design and Bid Packages• TOR for Construction Design and Bid Packages

	Development of the Environmental and Social Management Plan
Deliverables	Quarterly Progress Report

Of particular importance is the adherence of all construction and renovations to the required Health & Safety, Environmental, and Social Impact policies and requirements as stipulated in the IFC Performance Standards. SDSU will provide a side-by-side comparison of its policies and standards to the IFC Standards and detailing how the standards shall be implemented in the renovation/construction projects.

Subtasks 7.4 Phase 1a Renovations – Offices MCA Building

Start/End	Award plus 60 to award plus 180
Participants	SDSU, MCA-Georgia,
Key Milestone	Installation of appropriate operational systems
Deliverables	Include status in Quarterly Progress Reports 1 and 2

This phase is intended to complete the design, Bid-Package preparation, RFP, renovations, equipment procurement and outfitting, and acceptance of the facilities for the Dean's office and staff at the MCA building. Goal is to complete this for move-in by January 2015.

Subtasks 7.5 Phase 1b Renovations – English/STEM (TSU)

Start/End	Award plus 60 to award plus 180
Participants	SDSU, MCA-Georgia, TSU
Key Milestone	Completion the design, Bid-Package preparation, RFP, renovations, equipment procurement and outfitting, and acceptance of the facilities
Deliverables	Include status in Quarterly Progress Reports 1 and 2

This phase is intended to complete renovations of Smart Classrooms (5) and offices (3) for the English/ STEM Institute to support training at TSU. Goal is to complete this for move-in by January 2015.

Subtasks 7.6 Phase 2 Renovations – Classrooms/laboratories (TSU)

Start/End	Award plus 120 to award plus 300
Participants	SDSU, MCA-Georgia, TSU
Key Milestone	Completion the design, Bid-Package preparation, RFP, renovations, equipment procurement and outfitting, and acceptance of the facilities
Deliverables	Quarterly Progress Report

This phase is intended to complete the renovations of Classrooms (2), Lecture Hall, Laboratories (3), offices, etc. for the General Education courses to be offered to the first cohort of students. Goal is to complete this by May 2015 but no later than August 2015 to support classes starting in October 2015.

Subtasks 7.7 Phase 3 Renovations – Classrooms/Laboratories (GTU)

Start/End	Award plus 210 to award plus 390
Participants	SDSU, MCA-Georgia, GTU
Key Milestone	Completion the design, Bid-Package preparation, RFP, renovations, equipment procurement and outfitting, and acceptance of the facilities

Deliverables	Quarterly Progress Report
--------------	---------------------------

This phase is intended to complete renovation of Classrooms (2), Lecture Hall, Chemistry Laboratory, offices, etc. for General Education courses to be offered to the first cohort of students. Goal is to complete this by August 2015 to support classes starting in October 2015.

Subtasks 7.8 Phase 4 Construction Design and RFP – New Building (ISU)

Start/End	Award plus 60 to award plus 450
Participants	SDSU, MCA-Georgia,
Key Milestone	Complete the design, Bid-Package preparation, RFP, and award of the Construction Contract
Deliverables	Include status in all Quarterly Progress Reports

This phase is intended to complete the design, Bid-Package preparation, RFP, and award of the construction contract for the new building at ISU. Goal is to commence construction in October 2015.

Subtask 7.9 – Quarterly Task 7 Performance Assessments

Start/End	Award plus 30 – Award plus 450
Participants	SDSU, MCA-Georgia, Partner Institutions
Key Milestone	Continued management of recruitment objectives Assessment of Performance against plan and metrics Update Work Plan for Task 7
Deliverables	Include status in all Quarterly Progress Reports

As part of the quarterly progress reports, an assessment of the Task activities is to be provided along with any required modifications to the work plan or schedule for that Task. Any problems, issues, lessons learned, performance data, etc. will be included, as applicable

SDSU-Georgia – Month 16-60 Timeline and Justification, Enrollment Period

As proposed, the enrollment period contract is presumed to be a separate contract, with a start date in October 2015 to July 2019 (45-month period of performance). This document provides a provisional work plan and schedule, and assumes a start date in October 2015.

The following table is a line-item summary of the projected costs for continuation of the 7 tasks defined in the Pre-Enrollment Contract for the 45-month performance period.

SUMMARY								
Staffing	Labor, Fringe Benefits, LOE	\$	378,846	\$	474,487	\$	360,039	\$ 212,902 \$ 1,426,274
Travel	R/T Airfare, Per Diem, \$1000 Misc., Stipends, etc.	\$	289,621	\$	289,621	\$	244,221	\$ 188,940 \$ 1,012,403
Consultants/Services Agreements		\$	357,495	\$	90,000	\$	90,000	\$ 78,000 \$ 615,495
Facilities Construction/Renovations including 10% reserve		\$	2,814,660	\$	66,245	\$	95,688	\$ - \$ 2,976,593
Facilities Outfitting		\$	4,292,115	\$	3,439,255	\$	3,643,285	\$ - \$ 11,374,655
Other Direct Costs		\$	128,650	\$	45,700	\$	28,200	\$ 17,100 \$ 219,650
Total Direct Costs		\$	8,261,387	\$	4,405,308	\$	4,461,433	\$ 496,942 \$ 17,625,070
Indirect Costs (26% MTDC)		\$	911,367	\$	404,168	\$	413,574	\$ 129,205 \$ 1,858,314
TOTAL DELIVERY ORDER:		\$	9,172,754	\$	4,809,476	\$	4,875,007	\$ 626,147 \$ 19,483,384

Task 1 – Business Unit Operations, \$948,936

The primary purpose of Task 1 is to maintain the operations of the management team, program office, and administrative and operational programs and processes to achieve the objectives of the STEM Higher Education Project consistent with the projected terms of the 45-month contract. As appropriate, staffing positions, effort, and associated costs will progressively transition from the MCC-Investment funding to the operating budget (supported by tuition, GoG, and GRDF funds). The following table depicts the transition of Business Unit Operations staff.

Task 1	Business Unit Operations						
Staffing	Labor, Fringe Benefits, LOE	9-month Budget	12-month Budget	12-month Budget	12-month Budget	45-Month Total	
	Ken Walsh, Interim Dean (SDSU)	\$ 17,278	\$ 23,613	\$ 24,203	\$ 24,808	\$ 89,902	
	TBD Director - Business Finance (SDSURF)	\$ 13,376	\$ 18,281	\$ 18,738	\$ 19,206	\$ 69,601	
	TBD, Director External Relations (GE)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
	TBD, Administrative Support (GE-3/SDSU-1)	\$ 3,344	\$ 3,428	\$ 3,513	\$ 3,601	\$ 13,886	
	TBD, Procurement/Accountant Support (GE)	\$ 3,344	\$ 4,570	\$ 4,684	\$ -	\$ 12,599	
	TBD, Assistant Finance (GE-2)	\$ 10,032	\$ 13,711	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 23,743	
	Janov, Budget/Contracts (SDSURF)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
	Crockett, Project Coordination (SDSURF)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
	TBD, SDSU Campus Program Coordination (SDSU)	\$ 33,441	\$ 45,702	\$ 46,845	\$ -	\$ 125,988	
	TBD, Director Faculty/Student Affairs (GE)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
	TBD, Director Admissions (SDSU)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
	TBD, Construction/Renovation Management (SDSU)	\$ 93,634	\$ 127,966	\$ 65,583	\$ -	\$ 287,183	
	TBD, Director of Facilities (GE)	\$ 6,688	\$ 9,140	\$ 9,369	\$ -	\$ 25,198	
	TBD, Director Information Technology Systems (GE)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
	TBD, Assistant Admissions (GE)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Total Staffing		\$ 181,137	\$ 246,411	\$ 172,935	\$ 47,616	\$ 648,099	

Representative budget demonstrating reduced MCC-Investment in Business Unit Staffing over the projected 45-month period. Additional operating costs of approximate \$200k for this task cover travel, supplies, misc. expenses, and indirect.

Business Unit services will include evaluating and supervising professional consulting support services; overseeing the activities of Tasks 2 through 7 in collaboration with Partners; and administration of the program to include periodic assessments, reporting of metrics versus plans, and applying lessons learned. In addition, the Business Unit will be participating in the preparation and negotiation of the 45-month contract, and submission of the 45-month Inception Report, the remaining subtasks will be consistent with the requirements of key personnel at SDSU, the SDSU-Georgia program office and Partner Institutions

Reporting on the activities for this task will be included in the quarterly and annual reports, as directed by the anticipated contract language.

Task 2 – Accreditation – Managed by Program Staff, Budget \$55,093

As proposed, SDSU-Georgia will implement the follow-on degree programs in Civil and Construction Engineering to be implemented in CY3.

For this task, MCC-Investment funding will only be required in the first 12-months of the projected 45-month performance period because that period will support the full accreditation of the new degree programs. After that period, all proposed degree programs will be accredited and operational.

Future accreditation maintenance will be managed by GoG and tuition (Finalist Program Operations) budgets.

Reporting on the activities for this task will be included in the quarterly and annual reports, as directed by the anticipated contract language.

Task 3 – Articulation, Budget \$733,780

A major approach for supporting continuous ABET accreditation and capacity building at the partner institutions for undergraduate degree programs is to identify, modify (where needed), and accept for credit existing courses at these institutions that meet the ABET certification requirements of the SDSU-Georgia degree programs. A continuous evaluation and articulation assessment program will be implemented and supported at SDSU throughout the 45-month performance period.

Subtask 3.2 – Develop and Execute Articulation Plan

Start/End	Award to Award plus 1376
Participants	SDSU, Partner Universities
Key Milestone	Continue execution of Phase II articulation plan for Partner Universities' courses
Deliverables	Include status in all Quarterly Progress Reports

SDSU faculty will collaborate with counterparts at the Partner Universities. Additional courses will be submitted for evaluation quarterly – 2 per Partner per quarter.

Subtask 3.3 – Consulting/Services Agreements

Start/End	Award to Award plus 1376
Participants	SDSU, Consultants, Partner Institutions
Key Milestone	Execution of Agreements <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Translation Services – (May be performed by Partner Institutions)• Curriculum Development – (Collaborative course development)• ABET Accreditation of Articulated Courses
Deliverables	Include status in all Quarterly Progress Reports

Consulting/Service Agreements will be secured to support translation of SDSU degree program materials and for coordination of the preparation and submission of the accreditation packages. The Institutional Partners, however, may be engaged in this capacity since they will be submitting the packages on behalf of SDSU-Georgia.

Subtask 3.4 – Quarterly Task 3 Performance Assessments

Start/End	Award to Award plus 1376
Participants	SDSU, MCA-Georgia, Partner Institutions
Key Milestone	Continued management of institutional objectives Assessment of Performance against plan and metrics Update Work Plan for Task 3
Deliverables	Include status in all Quarterly Progress Reports

As part of the quarterly progress reports, an assessment of the Task activities is to be provided along with any required modifications to the work plan or schedule for that Task. Any problems, issues, lessons learned, performance data, etc. will be included, as applicable.

Task 4 – English/STEM Institute, Budget \$0

English/STEM Institute services will continue, but funding will transition fully to the operating budget in October 2015 supported by anticipated revenue (e.g., GRDF, GoG funding, and tuition).

Task 5 – Student Recruiting, Budget \$0

With successful completion of Task 2, a critical component of the start-up process, SDSU-Georgia degree programs will be accredited and certified at each partner institution. The programs will be listed along with the other national university selections available to students as choices pending their national examination results.

Student Recruitment will continue, but funding will transition fully to the operating budget as an activity most appropriately supported by anticipated revenue.

Task 6 – Faculty Recruitment/Training, Budget \$1,498,360

Faculty and support-staff are a critical part of the educational delivery system. It is the objective of SDSU-Georgia to provide infrastructure and support to enable the partner institutions to build their own capacity sufficient to provide and maintain ABET/ACS-accredited programs. In addition, intensive start-up requirements, facilities construction and management, and administrative duties require appropriate levels of senior management oversight. Staffing levels vary at research institutions in the United States and internationally.

Partner institution faculty will participate in orientation at SDSU prior to delivering the accredited collaborative courses. For courses taught during the summer, the SDSU orientation may be done over a summer session, while for other course it will take place during an academic semester. SDSU-Georgia will pay for travel including per diem, and the Partner Institution will cover their faculty's salary during the orientation period.

SDSU supports three training periods per calendar year – Fall Semester, Spring Semester, Summer Semester. Therefore, the following implementation schedule is reported based on calendar year and three potential training sessions per year. Because of the offset of SDSU semesters and partner institution instructional periods, training/orientation sessions (5-weeks) could occur at the beginning of the SDSU semester *without* impacting the Georgian faculty's ability to meet instructional requirements for their home institution later in the calendar year (e.g., SDSU Fall semester begin Aug. 15, Georgian faculty train until the end of September, and can still return to Georgia for the start of their semester).

Subtask 6.1 – Staffing

Start/End	Award – Award plus 1376
Participants	SDSU, Partner Institutions
Key Milestone	Continued support of three Assist Directors of Student/Faculty Affairs to be located at the Partner Institutions Engage SDSU Faculty Mentors/Trainers (4 – 1 per program plus 1 GE)
Deliverables	Include status in Quarterly Progress Reports

SDSU will engage faculty on its main campus to serve as mentors/trainers for visiting faculty from the Partner Institutions. There will be one SDSU faculty assigned for each of the degree programs and one for the general education courses. Plan is to have a ratio of one SDSU faculty for three Georgian faculty. Note: The Assistant Directors of Student/Faculty Affairs in Georgia are 50% time on Task 4 and 50% time on Task 5 and will serve as the coordinators in Georgia for faculty recruitment for the training program.

Subtask 6.2 – GE Faculty Training

Start/End	Award – Award plus 1376
Participants	SDSU, Partner Institutions
Key Milestone	An indoctrination training session will be conducted during the Fall Semester, Spring Semester, and Summer Session.
Deliverables	Include status in all Quarterly Progress Reports

Selected Georgian faculty members will be hosted at SDSU to gain experience with teaching approaches used at SDSU and to integrate SDSU curricula into their own instruction. SDSU faculty will continue to co-teach courses through in-person instruction, intensive instruction hybrid courses, or online approaches until the collaborative faculties of both SDSU and the host institution agree that the curriculum is sufficiently robust for independent ABET/ACS accreditation. During these visits to SDSU, Georgian faculty will live on campus and work closely with SDSU faculty to gain experience in teaching and assessing the course according to ABET standards, including training on use of the equipment and software to be purchased for the Georgian partner institution.

Subtask 6.3 – Quarterly Task 6 Performance Assessments

Start/End	Award plus– Award plus 1376
Participants	SDSU, MCA-Georgia, Partner Institutions
Key Milestone	Continued management of recruitment objectives Assessment of Performance against plan and metrics Update Work Plan for Task 6
Deliverables	Include status in all Quarterly Progress Reports

As part of the quarterly progress reports, an assessment of the Task activities is to be provided along with any required modifications to the work plan or schedule for that Task. Any problems, issues, lessons learned, performance data, etc. will be included, as applicable.

Objective 7 – Facilities Development, Budget \$16,247,215

SDSU, SDSU-Georgia, MCA-Georgia, and the Partner Institutions will collaborate on the development of facilities to support the delivery of courses and the overall administration of the program. Construction renovations and outfitting will be completed progressively over the 45-month

performance period. With renovation and construction completed by 2017. A detailed schedule for the design services, procurement activities, and execution will be included in the Inception Report for the 45-month contract. For additional details, refer to the submitted draft 45-month budget document. MCA-Georgia is responsible for all renovation and construction. SDSU is responsible for design, preparation of bid specifications, and for construction oversight, management, and endorsement of payment approvals, as well as procurement of all equipment and materials. Of the total budget, \$2,976,593 is budgeted to be retained by MCA-Georgia for the actual renovation and construction.

SUMMARY	Task 7	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y4	Total
Staffing	Labor, Fringe Benefits, LOE	\$ 36,540	\$ 49,938	\$ 25,593	\$ -	\$ 112,071
Travel	R/T Airfare, Per Diem, \$1000 Misc., Stipends, etc.	\$ 80,920	\$ 80,920	\$ 40,460	\$ -	\$ 202,300
Consultants/Services Agreements		\$ 254,495	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 254,495
Facilities Construction/Renovations including 10% reserve		\$ 2,814,660	\$ 66,245	\$ 95,688	\$ -	\$ 2,976,593
Facilities Outfitting		\$ 4,292,115	\$ 3,439,255	\$ 3,643,285	\$ -	\$ 11,374,655
Other Direct Costs		\$ 93,050	\$ 28,600	\$ 11,100	\$ -	\$ 132,750
	Total Direct Costs	\$ 7,571,780	\$ 3,664,958	\$ 3,816,126	\$ -	\$ 15,052,864
	Indirect Costs (MTDC)	\$ 736,879	\$ 211,677	\$ 245,794	\$ -	\$ 1,194,351
	TOTAL DELIVERY ORDER:	\$ 8,308,659	\$ 3,876,636	\$ 4,061,920	\$ -	\$ 16,247,215

Annex 4 – Updated List of Academic/Laboratory Equipment for Pre-Enrollment Period

The rest of this page is left intentionally blank.

Academic/Laboratory Equipment List

This section contains a list of academic and laboratory equipment for the Pre-Enrollment period. As presented in the Agreement, “equipment” is defined in OMB Circular A-110, Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Agreements with Institutions of Higher Education, Hospitals, and Other Non-Profit Organizations, as tangible, nonexpendable property charged directly to an award having a useful life of more than one year and an acquisition cost of \$5,000 or more per unit. Items with a unit price less than \$5,000 are classified as supplies in accordance with SDSU policies and NICRA. For the pre-enrollment period, the list of equipment by this definition was presented in the Agreement. No changes to this list have been identified. The list of equipment is:

Laboratory	Equipment	Quantity	Unit Cost	Partners
Chemistry General Ed	Hoods	7	\$35,000	TSU
	Gas Lines	12	\$6,000	
Chemistry Environmental	Hoods	14	\$35,000	TSU, GTU
	Gas Lines	24	\$6,000	
	GC	2	\$8,000	
	UV-Vis Spec	2	\$7,000	
	Ultra Purify Sys	2	\$6,000	
	Ovens	2	\$5,000	
	Analytical Balances	2	\$20,000	

Annex 5 – Comparative Analysis Map of SDSU Standards and IFC Performance Standard 1

The rest of this page is left intentionally blank.

A Comparison of IFC Performance Standard 1 and the California Environmental Quality Act

IFC Performance Standard 1 Guidance	Related CEQA California PRC Division 13, Environmental Quality Guidance	Comparison and Discussion
<p>1. Performance Standard 1 underscores the importance of managing environmental and social performance throughout the life of a project. An effective Environmental and Social Management System (ESMS) is a dynamic and continuous process initiated and supported by management, and involves engagement between the client, its workers, local communities directly affected by the project (the Affected Communities) and, where appropriate, other stakeholders.¹ Drawing on the elements of the established business management process of “plan, do, check, and act,” the ESMS entails a methodological approach to managing environmental and social risks² and impacts³ in a structured way on an ongoing basis. A good ESMS appropriate to the nature and scale of the project promotes sound and sustainable environmental and social performance, and can lead to improved financial, social, and environmental outcomes.</p>	<p>§ 21001. ADDITIONAL LEGISLATIVE INTENT^a The Legislature further finds and declares that it is the policy of the state to:</p> <p>(a) Develop and maintain a high-quality environment now and in the future, and take all action necessary to protect, rehabilitate, and enhance the environmental quality of the state.</p> <p>(b) Take all action necessary to provide the people of this state with clean air and water, enjoyment of aesthetic, natural, scenic, and historic environmental qualities, and freedom from excessive noise.</p> <p>(c) Prevent the elimination of fish or wildlife species due to man’s activities, insure that fish and wildlife populations do not drop below self-perpetuating levels, and preserve for future generations representations of all plant and animal communities and examples of the major periods of California history.</p> <p>(d) Ensure that the long-term protection of the environment, consistent with the provision of a decent home and suitable living environment for every Californian, shall be the guiding criterion in public decisions.</p> <p>(e) Create and maintain conditions under which man and nature can exist in productive harmony to fulfill the social and economic requirements of present and future generations.</p> <p>(f) Require governmental agencies at all levels to develop standards and procedures necessary to protect environmental quality.</p> <p>(g) Require governmental agencies at all levels to consider qualitative factors as well as economic and technical factors and long-term benefits and costs, in addition to short-term benefits and costs and to consider alternatives to proposed actions affecting the environment.</p>	<p>IFC Performance Standard 1 (PS1) calls for the completion of an ESMS that identifies environmental and social risks and impacts, as well as promotes sound and sustainable environmental and social performance. The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) states that it is the policy of California to develop and maintain a high-quality environment while also considering impacts to the residents of California. PS1 is more broad in scope, as it calls for managing environmental and social performance throughout the life of the project, whereas CEQA is primarily focused on project planning and pre-construction. PS1 also requires more involved stakeholder outreach than what is required under CEQA. Finally, social impacts are not individually considered under CEQA, which is in contrast to PS1. Despite these differences, however, the intent of PS1 and CEQA are generally similar: each process provides project proponents an opportunity to identify and disclose impacts and develop mitigation measures that may result in a more sustainable project. Thus, relative minor modifications of CEQA standards would achieve the IFC goals.</p>

¹ Other stakeholders are those not directly affected by the project but that have an interest in it. These could include national and local authorities, neighboring projects, and/or nongovernmental organizations.

² Environmental and social risk is a combination of the probability of certain hazard occurrences and the severity of impacts resulting from such an occurrence.

³ Environmental and social impacts refer to any change, potential or actual, to (i) the physical, natural, or cultural environment, and (ii) impacts on surrounding community and workers, resulting from the business activity to be supported.

^a Entries preceded by “§” are from the California Environmental Quality Act (California Public Resources Code, Division 13 – Environmental Quality. Other entries in this column are from the CEQA Guidelines, Title 14. California Code of Regulations and its Appendix G.

A Comparison of IFC Performance Standard 1 and the California Environmental Quality Act

<p>2. At times, the assessment and management of certain environmental and social risks and impacts may be the responsibility of the government or other third parties over which the client does not have control or influence.⁴ Examples of where this may happen include: (i) when early planning decisions are made by the government or third parties which affect the project site selection and/or design; and/or (ii) when specific actions directly related to the project are carried out by the government or third parties such as providing land for a project which may have previously involved the resettlement of communities or individuals and/or leading to loss of biodiversity. While the client cannot control these government or third party actions, an effective ESMS should identify the different entities involved and the roles they play, the corresponding risks they present to the client, and opportunities to collaborate with these third parties in order to help achieve environmental and social outcomes that are consistent with the Performance Standards. In addition, this Performance Standard supports the use of an effective grievance mechanism that can facilitate early indication of, and prompt remediation for those who believe that they have been harmed by a client's actions.</p>	<p>15051. CRITERIA FOR IDENTIFYING THE LEAD AGENCY Where two or more public agencies will be involved with a project, the determination of which agency will be the Lead Agency shall be governed by the following criteria: (a) If the project will be carried out by a public agency, that agency shall be the Lead Agency even if the project would be located within the jurisdiction of another public agency. (b) If the project is to be carried out by a nongovernmental person or entity, the Lead Agency shall be the public agency with the greatest responsibility for supervising or approving the project as a whole.</p> <p>§ 21080.3. CONSULTATION WITH RESPONSIBLE AGENCIES; ASSISTANCE BY OFFICE OF PLANNING AND RESEARCH (a) Prior to determining whether a negative declaration or environmental impact report is required for a project, the lead agency shall consult with all responsible agencies and trustee agencies. Prior to that required consultation, the lead agency may informally contact any of those agencies. (b) In order to expedite the requirements of subdivision (a), the Office of Planning and Research, upon request of a lead agency, shall assist the lead agency in determining the various responsible agencies and trustee agencies, for a proposed project. In the case of a project described in subdivision (c) of Section 21065, the request may also be made by the project applicant.</p> <p>§ 21003.1. ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS OF PROJECTS; COMMENTS FROM PUBLIC AND PUBLIC AGENCIES TO LEAD AGENCIES; AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION The Legislature further finds and declares it is the policy of the state that: (a) Comments from the public and public agencies on the environmental effects of a project shall be made to lead agencies as soon as possible in the review of environmental documents, including, but not limited to, draft environmental impact reports and negative declarations, in order to allow</p>	<p>PS1 states that it is possible that the assessment and management of risks may be responsibility of a party over which the client does not have control or influence. Similarly, CEQA states that, in the case of a project being carried out by a nongovernmental entity, the assessment and management of risks would become the task of the governmental agency with the greatest responsibility for supervising or approving the project. The ESMS should identify the roles different entities play in the project and a similar discussion is typical in large CEQA documents (i.e., EIRs). Under CEQA, lead agencies are encouraged to consult with other agencies that may have input on the proposed project. While not specified in PS1, the ESMS process would also be served by a similar level of inter-agency consultation.</p> <p>With respect to grievances, PS1 supports the development of mechanism that identifies and remediates harm by a proponent's action. CEQA does not require a similar formal mechanism. However, stakeholder grievances and comments can be submitted to the lead agency for consideration. The Final EIR includes a response by the lead agency to significant environmental points raised by these comments. Thus, minor adjustments to the procedures described in CEQA would meet the IFC goals.</p>
---	--	--

⁴ Contractors retained by, or acting on behalf of the client(s), are considered to be under direct control of the client and not considered third parties for the purposes of this Performance Standard.

A Comparison of IFC Performance Standard 1 and the California Environmental Quality Act

	<p>the lead agencies to identify, at the earliest possible time in the environmental review process, potential significant effects of a project, alternatives, and mitigation measures which would substantially reduce the effects.</p> <p>(b) Information relevant to the significant effects of a project, alternatives, and mitigation measures which substantially reduce the effects shall be made available as soon as possible by lead agencies, other public agencies, and interested persons and organizations.</p> <p>(c) Nothing in subdivisions (a) or (b) reduces or otherwise limits public review or comment periods currently prescribed either by statute or in guidelines prepared and adopted pursuant to Section 21083 for environmental documents, including, but not limited to, draft environmental impact reports and negative declarations.</p> <p>15132. CONTENTS OF FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT</p> <p>The Final EIR shall consist of:</p> <p>(a) The draft EIR or a revision of the draft.</p> <p>(b) Comments and recommendations received on the draft EIR either verbatim or in summary.</p> <p>(c) A list of persons, organizations, and public agencies commenting on the draft EIR.</p> <p>(d) The responses of the Lead Agency to significant environmental points raised in the review and consultation process.</p> <p>(e) Any other information added by the Lead Agency.</p>	
<p>3. Business should respect human rights, which means to avoid infringing on the human rights of others and address adverse human rights impacts business may cause or contribute to. Each of the Performance Standards has elements related to human rights dimensions that a project may face in the course of its operations. Due diligence against these Performance Standards will enable the client to address many relevant human rights issues in its project.</p>	<p>§ 21000. LEGISLATIVE INTENT</p> <p>(b) It is necessary to provide a high-quality environment that at all times is healthful and pleasing to the senses and intellect of man.</p> <p>(c) There is a need to understand the relationship between the maintenance of high-quality ecological systems and the general welfare of the people of the state, including their enjoyment of the natural resources of the state.</p> <p>(d) The capacity of the environment is limited, and it is the intent of the Legislature that the government of the state take immediate steps to identify any critical thresholds for the health and safety of the people of the state and take all</p>	<p>PS1 focuses specifically on the respect for human rights, which are considered here to include those contained in relevant articles of the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights. CEQA is not focused on “human rights” <i>per se</i>, but does recognize that the Act is meant to provide a satisfying living environment for the citizens of California. Human rights impacts and their resultant social ramifications are not dealt with under CEQA. Realistically, many of the human rights identified by the UN Declaration</p>

A Comparison of IFC Performance Standard 1 and the California Environmental Quality Act

	<p>coordinated actions necessary to prevent such thresholds being reached.</p> <p>(g) It is the intent of the Legislature that all agencies of the state government which regulate activities of private individuals, corporations, and public agencies which are found to affect the quality of the environment, shall regulate such activities so that major consideration is given to preventing environmental damage, while providing a decent home and satisfying living environment for every Californian.</p> <p>15131. ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL EFFECTS Economic or social information may be included in an EIR or may be presented in whatever form the agency desires.</p> <p>(a) Economic or social effects of a project shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment. An EIR may trace a chain of cause and effect from a proposed decision on a project through anticipated economic or social changes resulting from the project to physical changes caused in turn by the economic or social changes. The intermediate economic or social changes need not be analyzed in any detail greater than necessary to trace the chain of cause and effect. The focus of the analysis shall be on the physical changes.</p>	<p>are rights already protected under US federal and/or California state law.</p>
<p>4. This Performance Standard applies to business activities with environmental and/or social risks and/or impacts. For the purposes of this Performance Standard, the term “project” refers to a defined set of business activities, including those where specific physical elements, aspects, and facilities likely to generate risks and impacts, have yet to be identified.⁵ Where applicable, this could include aspects from the early developmental stages through the entire life cycle (design, construction, commissioning, operation, decommissioning, closure or, where applicable, post-closure) of a physical asset.⁶ The</p>	<p>§ 21065. PROJECT “Project” means an activity which may cause either a direct physical change in the environment, or a reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment, and which is any of the following:</p> <p>(a) An activity directly undertaken by any public agency.</p> <p>(b) An activity undertaken by a person which is supported, in whole or in part, through contracts, grants, subsidies, loans, or other forms of assistance from one or more public agencies.</p> <p>(c) An activity that involves the issuance to a person of a lease, permit, license, certificate, or other entitlement for use by one or more public agencies.</p>	<p>CEQA defines a project as an activity that causes a change in the physical environment, while PS1 defines a project as a set of “business activities” that may cause an impact. The impacts discussed in PS1 could ostensibly be physical (like CEQA), social, or economic. Additionally, CEQA assumes a level of governmental agency involvement, through direct action, funding, or permitting; PS1 does not necessarily assume governmental agency involvement on any level. Finally, PS1 states that the stages of a project</p>

⁵ For example, corporate entities which have portfolios of existing physical assets, and/or intend to develop or acquire new facilities, and investment funds or financial intermediaries with existing portfolios of assets and/or which intend to invest in new facilities.

⁶ Recognizing that this Performance Standard is used by a variety of financial institutions, investors, insurers, and owner/operators, each user should separately specify the business activities to which this Performance Standard should apply.

A Comparison of IFC Performance Standard 1 and the California Environmental Quality Act

<p>requirements of this Performance Standard apply to all business activities unless otherwise noted in the specific limitations described in each of the paragraphs below.</p>		<p>include the entire life cycle of a physical asset, while CEQA is generally focused on one end of the life cycle or the other; environmental analyses are completed for construction/operations or for decommissioning/post-closure, but rarely both. Certain mitigation measures required for projects approved under CEQA can result in on-going commitments, such as measures to designed to avoid impacts to sensitive species during ongoing operations and maintenance activities.</p>
<p>5. The client, in coordination with other responsible government agencies and third parties as appropriate,⁷ will conduct a process of environmental and social assessment, and establish and maintain an ESMS appropriate to the nature and scale of the project and commensurate with the level of its environmental and social risks and impacts. The ESMS will incorporate the following elements: (i) policy; (ii) identification of risks and impacts; (iii) management programs; (iv) organizational capacity and competency; (v) emergency preparedness and response; (vi) stakeholder engagement; and (vii) monitoring and review.</p>	<p>15120. GENERAL</p> <p>(a) Environmental Impact Reports shall contain the information outlined in this article, but the format of the document may be varied. Each element must be covered, and when these elements are not separated into distinct sections, the document shall state where in the document each element is discussed.</p> <p>(b) The EIR may be prepared as a separate document, as part of a general plan, or as part of a project report. If prepared as a part of the project report, it must still contain one separate and distinguishable section providing either analysis of all the subjects required in an EIR or, as a minimum, a table showing where each of the subjects is discussed. When the Lead Agency is a state agency, the EIR shall be included as part of the regular project report if such a report is used in the agency's existing review and budgetary process.</p> <p>(c) Draft EIRs shall contain the information required by Sections 15122 through 15131. Final EIRs shall contain the same information and the subjects described in Section 15132.</p> <p>(d) No document prepared pursuant to this article that is available for public examination shall include a "trade secret" as defined in Section 6254.7 of the Government Code, information about the location of archaeological sites and sacred lands, or any other information that is subject to the</p>	<p>The ESMS described by PS1 is more expansive in its analysis and content than a typical CEQA EIR, although some portions of the respective documents do parallel one another. Specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ESMS should include a policy statement, which is interpreted here to be similar to an EIR-level project description and/or "purpose and need" discussion. • The identification of risks and impacts in an ESMS is also very similar to the level of environmental analysis in an EIR. • A discussion of organizational capacity and competency is required in an ESMS; however, CEQA assumes a level of capacity and competency on the part of the lead agency and it is not specifically discussed in the environmental analysis. • The ESMS includes a discussion on emergency preparedness and response. In an EIR, the impact of the project on emergency preparedness and response times is

⁷ That is, those parties legally obligated and responsible for assessing and managing specific risks and impacts (e.g., government-led resettlement).

A Comparison of IFC Performance Standard 1 and the California Environmental Quality Act

	<p>disclosure restrictions of Section 6254 of the Government Code.</p> <p>VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:</p> <p>g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</p> <p>XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES.</p> <p>a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:</p> <p>Fire protection?</p> <p>Police protection?</p> <p>XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:</p> <p>e) Result in inadequate emergency access?</p>	<p>discussed as part of the environmental analysis (typically in the Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Public Services, and Transportation/ Traffic sections). Typically the analysis focuses on the project's potential effects on an existing emergency service provider or plan. If affected, an EIR can discuss minimization/mitigation measures that may offset these impacts. However, in an EIR, a discussion of project-specific emergency preparedness and response is not considered a stand-alone section.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ESMS requires a summary of stakeholder engagement and a plan for ongoing outreach and communication. An EIR will typically include a description of consultation and outreach conducted as part of the environmental analysis; however, a formal outreach and communication plan for the life of the project is not required under CEQA (unless specifically required as part of mitigation, which is very rare). • The ESMS requires monitoring and review activities for the life of the project. Depending on project impacts, an EIR may also include a description of monitoring, review, and reporting activities to be conducted by the lead agency or others. However, these monitoring activities typically cease after project construction or remediation is complete; these activities do not typically continue through the life of the project under CEQA. <p>A major difference is that IFC continues throughout the life of the</p>
--	--	--

A Comparison of IFC Performance Standard 1 and the California Environmental Quality Act

		project while CEQA only applies for the process itself. A minor modification of CEQA would meet the IFC standard.
<p>6. The client will establish an overarching policy defining the environmental and social objectives and principles that guide the project to achieve sound environmental and social performance.⁸ The policy provides a framework for the environmental and social assessment and management process, and specifies that the project (or business activities, as appropriate) will comply with the applicable laws and regulations of the jurisdictions in which it is being undertaken, including those laws implementing host country obligations under international law. The policy should be consistent with the principles of the Performance Standards. Under some circumstances, clients may also subscribe to other internationally recognized standards, certification schemes, or codes of practice and these too should be included in the policy. The policy will indicate who, within the client's organization, will ensure conformance with the policy and be responsible for its execution (with reference to an appropriate responsible government agency or third party, as necessary). The client will communicate the policy to all levels of its organization.</p>	<p>15124. PROJECT DESCRIPTION</p> <p>The description of the project shall contain the following information but should not supply extensive detail beyond that needed for evaluation and review of the environmental impact.</p> <p>(a) The precise location and boundaries of the proposed project shall be shown on a detailed map, preferably topographic. The location of the project shall also appear on a regional map.</p> <p>(b) A statement of objectives sought by the proposed project. A clearly written statement of objectives will help the lead agency develop a reasonable range of alternatives to evaluate in the EIR and will aid the decision makers in preparing findings or a statement of overriding considerations, if necessary. The statement of objectives should include the underlying purpose of the project.</p> <p>(c) A general description of the project's technical, economic, and environmental characteristics, considering the principal engineering proposals if any and supporting public service facilities.</p> <p>(d) A statement briefly describing the intended uses of the EIR.</p> <p>(1) This statement shall include, to the extent that the information is known to the Lead Agency,</p> <p>(A) A list of the agencies that are expected to use the EIR in their decision making, and</p> <p>(B) A list of permits and other approvals required to implement the project.</p> <p>(C) A list of related environmental review and consultation requirements required by federal, state, or local laws, regulations, or policies. To the fullest extent possible, the lead agency should integrate CEQA review with these related environmental review and consultation requirements.</p>	<p>PS1 states that a policy should be defined that guides the sound environmental and social performance of the project. CEQA itself provides the overarching framework for assessing environmental impacts. Within an EIR, the project description includes a description of permits and approvals needed by the project to comply with applicable laws and regulations. In the US, it is uncommon for other international standards or codes of practice to be required by a lead agency. For an EIR, the lead agency contact is clearly stated in the front matter as a matter of practice and its inclusion is not required by statute. CEQA assumes that all levels of the lead agency are familiar with the proposed project and does not require a formal communication plan within an agency. A minor modification of procedure would achieve this goal.</p>

⁸ This requirement is a stand-alone, project-specific policy and is not intended to affect (or require alteration of) existing policies the client may have defined for non-related projects, business activities, or higher-level corporate activities.

A Comparison of IFC Performance Standard 1 and the California Environmental Quality Act

<p>7. The client will establish and maintain a process for identifying the environmental and social risks and impacts of the project (see paragraph 18 for competency requirements). The type, scale, and location of the project guide the scope and level of effort devoted to the risks and impacts identification process. The scope of the risks and impacts identification process will be consistent with good international industry practice,⁹ and will determine the appropriate and relevant methods and assessment tools. The process may comprise a full-scale environmental and social impact assessment, a limited or focused environmental and social assessment, or straightforward application of environmental siting, pollution standards, design criteria, or construction standards.¹⁰ When the project involves existing assets, environmental and/or social audits or risk/hazard assessments can be appropriate and sufficient to identify risks and impacts. If assets to be developed, acquired or financed have yet to be defined, the establishment of an environmental and social due diligence process will identify risks and impacts at a point in the future when the physical elements, assets, and facilities are reasonably understood. The risks and impacts identification process will be based on recent environmental and social baseline data at an appropriate level of detail. The process will consider all relevant environmental and social risks and impacts of the project, including the issues identified in Performance Standards 2 through 8, and those who are likely to be affected by such risks and impacts.¹¹ The risks and impacts identification process will consider the emissions of greenhouse gases, the relevant risks associated with a</p>	<p>15063. INITIAL STUDY</p> <p>(a) Following preliminary review, the Lead Agency shall conduct an Initial Study to determine if the project may have a significant effect on the environment. If the Lead Agency can determine that an EIR will clearly be required for the project, an Initial Study is not required but may still be desirable.</p> <p>(1) All phases of project planning, implementation, and operation must be considered in the Initial Study of the project.</p> <p>(2) To meet the requirements of this section, the lead agency may use an environmental assessment or a similar analysis prepared pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act.</p> <p>(3) An initial study may rely upon expert opinion supported by facts, technical studies or other substantial evidence to document its findings. However, an initial study is neither intended nor required to include the level of detail included in an EIR.</p> <p>(b) Results.</p> <p>(1) If the agency determines that there is substantial evidence that any aspect of the project, either individually or cumulatively, may cause a significant effect on the environment, regardless of whether the overall effect of the project is adverse or beneficial, the Lead Agency shall do one of the following:</p> <p>(A) Prepare an EIR, or</p> <p>(B) Use a previously prepared EIR which the Lead Agency determines would adequately analyze the project at hand, or</p> <p>(C) Determine, pursuant to a program EIR, tiering, or another appropriate process, which of a project's effects were adequately examined by an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Another appropriate process may include, for example, a master EIR, a master environmental assessment, approval of housing and neighborhood commercial facilities</p>	<p>PS1 requires a preliminary process to identify environmental and social risks to determine the level of subsequent analysis. Under CEQA, the environmental analysis process can be started by conducting an Initial Study. Under PS1 or CEQA, both processes ultimately result in determining the appropriate and relevant methods and assessment tools. The CEQA initial study can be conducted prior to a formal project description and can be used to preliminarily address potential impacts across a wide range of issue areas, including pollution, water quality, and greenhouse gas impacts.</p>
--	--	--

⁹ Defined as the exercise of professional skill, diligence, prudence, and foresight that would reasonably be expected from skilled and experienced professionals engaged in the same type of undertaking under the same or similar circumstances globally or regionally.

¹⁰ For greenfield developments or large expansions with specifically identified physical elements, aspects, and facilities that are likely to generate potential significant environmental or social impacts, the client will conduct a comprehensive Environmental and Social Impact Assessment, including an examination of alternatives, where appropriate.

¹¹ In limited high risk circumstances, it may be appropriate for the client to complement its environmental and social risks and impacts identification process with specific human rights due diligence as relevant to the particular business.

A Comparison of IFC Performance Standard 1 and the California Environmental Quality Act

<p>changing climate and the adaptation opportunities, and potential transboundary effects, such as pollution of air, or use or pollution of international waterways.</p>	<p>in urban areas, approval of residential projects pursuant to a specific plans described in section 15182, approval of residential projects consistent with a community plan, general plan or zoning as described in section 15183, or an environmental document prepared under a State certified regulatory program. The lead agency shall then ascertain which effects, if any, should be analyzed in a later EIR or negative declaration.</p> <p>(2) The Lead Agency shall prepare a Negative Declaration if there is no substantial evidence that the project or any of its aspects may cause a significant effect on the environment.</p>	
<p>8. Where the project involves specifically identified physical elements, aspects, and facilities that are likely to generate impacts, environmental and social risks and impacts will be identified in the context of the project's area of influence. This area of influence encompasses, as appropriate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The area likely to be affected by: (i) the project¹² and the client's activities and facilities that are directly owned, operated or managed (including by contractors) and that are a component of the project;¹³ (ii) impacts from unplanned but predictable developments caused by the project that may occur later or at a different location; or (iii) indirect project impacts on biodiversity or on ecosystem services upon which Affected Communities' livelihoods are dependent. ▪ Associated facilities, which are facilities that are not funded as part of the project and that would not have been constructed or expanded if the project did not exist and without which the project would not be viable.¹⁴ ▪ Cumulative impacts¹⁵ that result from the incremental impact, on areas or resources used or directly impacted by the project, from other 	<p>15125. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING</p> <p>(a) An EIR must include a description of the physical environmental conditions in the vicinity of the project, as they exist at the time the notice of preparation is published, or if no notice of preparation is published, at the time environmental analysis is commenced, from both a local and regional perspective. This environmental setting will normally constitute the baseline physical conditions by which a lead agency determines whether an impact is significant. The description of the environmental setting shall be no longer than is necessary to an understanding of the significant effects of the proposed project and its alternatives.</p> <p>(c) Knowledge of the regional setting is critical to the assessment of environmental impacts. Special emphasis should be placed on environmental resources that are rare or unique to that region and would be affected by the project. The EIR must demonstrate that the significant environmental impacts of the proposed project were adequately investigated and discussed and it must permit the significant effects of the project to be considered in the full environmental context.</p> <p>(d) The EIR shall discuss any inconsistencies between the</p>	<p>Both PS1 and CEQA require the identification of an area of influence. Under CEQA, the area of influence is defined as part of the environmental setting. In both PS1 and CEQA, the area of influence should include the physical areas likely to be affected by direct, indirect, induced, and cumulative impacts.</p>

¹² Examples include the project's sites, the immediate airshed and watershed, or transport corridors.

¹³ Examples include power transmission corridors, pipelines, canals, tunnels, relocation and access roads, borrow and disposal areas, construction camps, and contaminated land (e.g., soil, groundwater, surface water, and sediments).

¹⁴ Associated facilities may include railways, roads, captive power plants or transmission lines, pipelines, utilities, warehouses, and logistics terminals.

¹⁵ Cumulative impacts are limited to those impacts generally recognized as important on the basis of scientific concerns and/or concerns from Affected Communities. Examples of cumulative impacts include: incremental contribution of gaseous emissions to an airshed; reduction of water flows in a watershed due to multiple withdrawals; increases in sediment loads to a watershed; interference with migratory routes or wildlife movement; or more traffic congestion and accidents due to increases in vehicular traffic on community roadways.

A Comparison of IFC Performance Standard 1 and the California Environmental Quality Act

existing, planned or reasonably defined developments at the time the risks and impacts identification process is conducted.	proposed project and applicable general plans, specific plans, and regional plans. Such regional plans include, but are not limited to, the applicable air quality attainment or maintenance plan or State Implementation Plan, area-wide waste treatment and water quality control plans, regional transportation plans, regional housing allocation plans, regional blueprint plans, plans for the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, habitat conservation plans, natural community conservation plans and regional land use plans for the protection of the Coastal Zone, Lake Tahoe Basin, San Francisco Bay, and Santa Monica Mountains.	
9. In the event of risks and impacts in the project's area of influence resulting from a third party's actions, the client will address those risks and impacts in a manner commensurate with the client's control and influence over the third parties, and with due regard to conflict of interest.	15130. DISCUSSION OF CUMULATIVE IMPACTS (a) An EIR shall discuss cumulative impacts of a project when the project's incremental effect is cumulatively considerable, as defined in section 15065 (a)(3). Where a lead agency is examining a project with an incremental effect that is not "cumulatively considerable," a lead agency need not consider that effect significant, but shall briefly describe its basis for concluding that the incremental effect is not cumulatively considerable.	PS1 states that the project proponent should address risks and impacts associated with third party's actions. Similarly, CEQA requires a discussion of cumulative impacts. The analysis of cumulative effects typically includes a discussion of third party actions in the area of influence.
10. Where the client can reasonably exercise control, the risks and impacts identification process will also consider those risks and impacts associated with primary supply chains, as defined in Performance Standard 2 (paragraphs 27–29) and Performance Standard 6 (paragraph 30).	15126.2 CONSIDERATION AND DISCUSSION OF SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS. (a) The Significant Environmental Effects of the Proposed Project. An EIR shall identify and focus on the significant environmental effects of the proposed project. In assessing the impact of a proposed project on the environment, the lead agency should normally limit its examination to changes in the existing physical conditions in the affected area as they exist at the time the notice of preparation is published, or where no notice of preparation is published, at the time environmental analysis is commenced. Direct and indirect significant effects of the project on the environment shall be clearly identified and described, giving due consideration to both the short-term and long-term effects. ...	PS1 requires the project proponent to analyze risks and impacts associated with primary supply chains. The risks and impacts associated with primary supply chains are considered indirect impacts under CEQA. CEQA requires a consideration and discussion of direct and indirect effects, giving due consideration to short-term and long-term effects.
11. Where the project involves specifically identified physical elements, aspects and facilities that are likely to generate environmental and social impacts, the identification of risks and impacts will take into account the findings and conclusions of related and applicable plans, studies, or assessments prepared by relevant government authorities or other parties	15150. INCORPORATION BY REFERENCE (a) An EIR or Negative Declaration may incorporate by reference all or portions of another document which is a matter of public record or is generally available to the public. Where all or part of another document is incorporated by reference, the incorporated language shall be considered to	PS1 states that the impact analysis should take into account findings and conclusions of related plans and studies. CEQA guidelines state that related technical studies can be incorporated by reference if they are matter of public record or generally available to the public.

A Comparison of IFC Performance Standard 1 and the California Environmental Quality Act

<p>that are directly related to the project and its area of influence.¹⁶ These include master economic development plans, country or regional plans, feasibility studies, alternatives analyses, and cumulative, regional, sectoral, or strategic environmental assessments where relevant. The risks and impacts identification will take account of the outcome of the engagement process with Affected Communities as appropriate.</p>	<p>be set forth in full as part of the text of the EIR or Negative Declaration.</p> <p>(e) Examples of materials that may be incorporated by reference include but are not limited to:</p> <p>(1) A description of the environmental setting from another EIR.</p> <p>(2) A description of the air pollution problems prepared by an air pollution control agency concerning a process involved in the project.</p> <p>(3) A description of the city or county general plan that applies to the location of the project.</p> <p>(4) A description of the effects of greenhouse gas emissions on the environment.</p> <p>15130. DISCUSSION OF CUMULATIVE IMPACTS</p> <p>(a) An EIR shall discuss cumulative impacts of a project when the project's incremental effect is cumulatively considerable, as defined in section 15065 (a)(3). Where a lead agency is examining a project with an incremental effect that is not "cumulatively considerable," a lead agency need not consider that effect significant, but shall briefly describe its basis for concluding that the incremental effect is not cumulatively considerable.</p> <p>(b)(1)(B) A summary of projections contained in an adopted local, regional or statewide plan, or related planning document, that describes or evaluates conditions contributing to the cumulative effect. Such plans may include: a general plan, regional transportation plan, or plans for the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. A summary of projections may also be contained in an adopted or certified prior environmental document for such a plan. Such projections may be supplemented with additional information such as a regional modeling program. Any such document shall be referenced and made available to the public at a location specified by the lead agency.</p> <p>(d) Previously approved land use documents, including, but not limited to, general plans, specific plans, regional</p>	<p>Additionally, regional plans and policies should be taken into consideration in the cumulative impact analysis. With regard to the outcome of the engagement process, CEQA requires that the Final EIR include responses to public comments on significant environmental points.</p>
--	---	---

¹⁶ The client can take these into account by focusing on the project's incremental contribution to selected impacts generally recognized as important on the basis of scientific concern or concerns from the Affected Communities within the area addressed by these larger scope regional studies or cumulative assessments.

A Comparison of IFC Performance Standard 1 and the California Environmental Quality Act

	<p>transportation plans, plans for the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, and local coastal plans may be used in cumulative impact analysis. A pertinent discussion of cumulative impacts contained in one or more previously certified EIRs may be incorporated by reference pursuant to the provisions for tiering and program EIRs. No further cumulative impacts analysis is required when a project is consistent with a general, specific, master or comparable programmatic plan where the lead agency determines that the regional or areawide cumulative impacts of the proposed project have already been adequately addressed, as defined in section 15152(f), in a certified EIR for that plan.</p> <p>15132. CONTENTS OF FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT The Final EIR shall consist of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) The draft EIR or a revision of the draft. (b) Comments and recommendations received on the draft EIR either verbatim or in summary. (c) A list of persons, organizations, and public agencies commenting on the draft EIR. (d) The responses of the Lead Agency to significant environmental points raised in the review and consultation process. (e) Any other information added by the Lead Agency. 	
<p>12. Where the project involves specifically identified physical elements, aspects and facilities that are likely to generate impacts, and as part of the process of identifying risks and impacts, the client will identify individuals and groups that may be directly and differentially or disproportionately affected by the project because of their disadvantaged or vulnerable status.¹⁷ Where individuals or groups are identified as disadvantaged or vulnerable, the client will propose and implement differentiated measures so that adverse impacts do not fall disproportionately on them and they are not disadvantaged in sharing</p>	<p>15131. ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL EFFECTS Economic or social information may be included in an EIR or may be presented in whatever form the agency desires.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Economic or social effects of a project shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment. An EIR may trace a chain of cause and effect from a proposed decision on a project through anticipated economic or social changes resulting from the project to physical changes caused in turn by the economic or social changes. The intermediate economic or social changes need not be analyzed in any detail greater than necessary to trace the chain of cause and effect. The focus of the analysis shall be on the physical 	<p>PS1 requires that individuals or groups that may be disproportionately affected by the project because of their disadvantaged or vulnerable status be identified and mitigation measures be developed. CEQA does not include this requirement, although a broad interpretation of Section 15131 could conceivably result in a CEQA analysis considering the impacts to a disadvantaged or vulnerable group in its determination of significance for a physical change.</p>

¹⁷ This disadvantaged or vulnerable status may stem from an individual's or group's race, color, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth, or other status. The client should also consider factors such as gender, age, ethnicity, culture, literacy, sickness, physical or mental disability, poverty or economic disadvantage, and dependence on unique natural resources.

A Comparison of IFC Performance Standard 1 and the California Environmental Quality Act

development benefits and opportunities.	<p>changes.</p> <p>(b) Economic or social effects of a project may be used to determine the significance of physical changes caused by the project. For example, if the construction of a new freeway or rail line divides an existing community, the construction would be the physical change, but the social effect on the community would be the basis for determining that the effect would be significant. As an additional example, if the construction of a road and the resulting increase in noise in an area disturbed existing religious practices in the area, the disturbance of the religious practices could be used to determine that the construction and use of the road and the resulting noise would be significant effects on the environment. The religious practices would need to be analyzed only to the extent to show that the increase in traffic and noise would conflict with the religious practices. Where an EIR uses economic or social effects to determine that a physical change is significant, the EIR shall explain the reason for determining that the effect is significant.</p>	<p>It should be noted that Executive Order 12898, which applies to projects under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), explicitly requires an analysis of disproportionate impacts to disadvantaged populations (i.e., minority and low income communities).</p>
<p>13. Consistent with the client's policy and the objectives and principles described therein, the client will establish management programs that, in sum, will describe mitigation and performance improvement measures and actions that address the identified environmental and social risks and impacts of the project.</p>	<p>15126.4 CONSIDERATION AND DISCUSSION OF MITIGATION MEASURES PROPOSED TO MINIMIZE SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS.</p> <p>(a) Mitigation Measures in General.</p> <p>(1) An EIR shall describe feasible measures which could minimize significant adverse impacts, including where relevant, inefficient and unnecessary consumption of energy.</p> <p>(A) The discussion of mitigation measures shall distinguish between the measures which are proposed by project proponents to be included in the project and other measures proposed by the lead, responsible or trustee agency or other persons which are not included but the lead agency determines could reasonably be expected to reduce adverse impacts if required as conditions of approving the project. This discussion shall identify mitigation measures for each significant environmental effect identified in the EIR.</p> <p>(B) Where several measures are available to mitigate an impact, each should be discussed and the basis for selecting a particular measure should be identified. Formulation of mitigation measures should not be deferred until some future time. However, measures may specify performance</p>	<p>PS1 requires the establishment of management programs and mitigation measures that address identified environmental and social risks and impacts of the project. As stated elsewhere, social impacts are not specifically addressed in CEQA. However, CEQA does require mitigation measures to be described in an EIR that could minimize significant adverse environmental impacts. CEQA is more explicit than PS1 with respect to requiring a definition of standards and time frames that must be met for mitigation to be achieved, and defining responsibilities for carrying out and enforcing mitigation.</p>

A Comparison of IFC Performance Standard 1 and the California Environmental Quality Act

	<p>standards which would mitigate the significant effect of the project and which may be accomplished in more than one specified way.</p> <p>15097. MITIGATION MONITORING OR REPORTING. (e) At its discretion, an agency may adopt standardized policies and requirements to guide individually adopted monitoring or reporting programs. Standardized policies and requirements may describe, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) The relative responsibilities of various departments within the agency for various aspects of monitoring or reporting, including lead responsibility for administering typical programs and support responsibilities. (2) The responsibilities of the project proponent. (3) Agency guidelines for preparing monitoring or reporting programs. (4) General standards for determining project compliance with the mitigation measures or revisions and related conditions of approval. (5) Enforcement procedures for noncompliance, including provisions for administrative appeal. (6) Process for informing staff and decision makers of the relative success of mitigation measures and using those results to improve future mitigation measures. 	
<p>14. Depending on the nature and scale of the project, these programs may consist of some documented combination of operational procedures, practices, plans, and related supporting documents (including legal agreements) that are managed in a systematic way.¹⁸ The programs may apply broadly across the client's organization, including contractors and primary suppliers over which the organization has control or influence, or to specific sites, facilities, or activities. The mitigation hierarchy to address identified risks and impacts will favor the avoidance of impacts</p>	<p>15126.4 CONSIDERATION AND DISCUSSION OF MITIGATION MEASURES PROPOSED TO MINIMIZE SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS. (a)(2) Mitigation measures must be fully enforceable through permit conditions, agreements, or other legally binding instruments. In the case of the adoption of a plan, policy, regulation, or other public project, mitigation measures can be incorporated into the plan, policy, regulation, or project design.</p> <p>15370. MITIGATION "Mitigation" includes:</p>	<p>PS1 provides some ideas with regard to mitigation programs and policies, as well as suggestions as to what part of the project proponent's organization they can be applied. PS1 states that avoidance is favored over minimization and that compensation can be provided where residual impacts remain. CEQA guidelines also provide ideas as to what mitigation can be; however, avoidance is not explicitly prioritized over impact minimization. A provision for</p>

¹⁸ Existing legal agreements between the client and third parties that address mitigation actions with regard to specific impacts constitute part of a program. Examples are government-managed resettlement responsibilities specified in an agreement.

A Comparison of IFC Performance Standard 1 and the California Environmental Quality Act

<p>over minimization, and, where residual impacts remain, compensation/offset, wherever technically¹⁹ and financially feasible.²⁰</p>	<p>(a) Avoiding the impact altogether by not taking a certain action or parts of an action. (b) Minimizing impacts by limiting the degree or magnitude of the action and its implementation. (c) Rectifying the impact by repairing, rehabilitating, or restoring the impacted environment. (d) Reducing or eliminating the impact over time by preservation and maintenance operations during the life of the action. (e) Compensating for the impact by replacing or providing substitute resources or environments.</p>	<p>compensation is present in CEQA.</p>
<p>15. Where the identified risks and impacts cannot be avoided, the client will identify mitigation and performance measures and establish corresponding actions to ensure the project will operate in compliance with applicable laws and regulations, and meet the requirements of Performance Standards 1 through 8. The level of detail and complexity of this collective management program and the priority of the identified measures and actions will be commensurate with the project's risks and impacts, and will take account of the outcome of the engagement process with Affected Communities as appropriate.</p>	<p>15126.4 CONSIDERATION AND DISCUSSION OF MITIGATION MEASURES PROPOSED TO MINIMIZE SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS. (a) Mitigation Measures in General. (1) An EIR shall describe feasible measures which could minimize significant adverse impacts, including where relevant, inefficient and unnecessary consumption of energy. (A) The discussion of mitigation measures shall distinguish between the measures which are proposed by project proponents to be included in the project and other measures proposed by the lead, responsible or trustee agency or other persons which are not included but the lead agency determines could reasonably be expected to reduce adverse impacts if required as conditions of approving the project. This discussion shall identify mitigation measures for each significant environmental effect identified in the EIR. (B) Where several measures are available to mitigate an impact, each should be discussed and the basis for selecting a particular measure should be identified. Formulation of mitigation measures should not be deferred until some future time. However, measures may specify performance standards which would mitigate the significant effect of the project and which may be accomplished in more than one specified way. (C) Energy conservation measures, as well as other</p>	<p>PS1 requires the establishment of management programs and mitigation measures that address identified environmental and social risks and impacts of the project, and that these actions operate in compliance with applicable laws and regulations. As stated elsewhere, social impacts are not specifically addressed in CEQA. However, CEQA does require mitigation measures to be described in an EIR that could minimize significant adverse environmental impacts. CEQA requires that mitigation measures be enforceable through legally binding instruments, which assumes compliance with applicable laws and regulations. CEQA requires that the mitigation be "roughly proportional" to the impact, which is similar to the PS1 requirement that measures be "commensurate with the project's risks and impacts."</p>

¹⁹ Technical feasibility is based on whether the proposed measures and actions can be implemented with commercially available skills, equipment, and materials, taking into consideration prevailing local factors such as climate, geography, demography, infrastructure, security, governance, capacity, and operational reliability.

²⁰ Financial feasibility is based on commercial considerations, including relative magnitude of the incremental cost of adopting such measures and actions compared to the project's investment, operating, and maintenance costs, and on whether this incremental cost could make the project nonviable to the client.

A Comparison of IFC Performance Standard 1 and the California Environmental Quality Act

	<p>appropriate mitigation measures, shall be discussed when relevant. Examples of energy conservation measures are provided in Appendix F.</p> <p>(D) If a mitigation measure would cause one or more significant effects in addition to those that would be caused by the project as proposed, the effects of the mitigation measure shall be discussed but in less detail than the significant effects of the project as proposed. (Stevens v. City of Glendale (1981) 125 Cal.App.3d 986.)</p> <p>(2) Mitigation measures must be fully enforceable through permit conditions, agreements, or other legally binding instruments. In the case of the adoption of a plan, policy, regulation, or other public project, mitigation measures can be incorporated into the plan, policy, regulation, or project design.</p> <p>(3) Mitigation measures are not required for effects which are not found to be significant.</p> <p>(4) Mitigation measures must be consistent with all applicable constitutional requirements, including the following:</p> <p>(A) There must be an essential nexus (i.e. connection) between the mitigation measure and a legitimate governmental interest. Nollan v. California Coastal Commission, 483 U.S. 825 (1987); and</p> <p>(B) The mitigation measure must be "roughly proportional" to the impacts of the project. Dolan v. City of Tigard, 512 U.S. 374 (1994). Where the mitigation measure is an ad hoc exaction, it must be "roughly proportional" to the impacts of the project. Ehrlich v. City of Culver City (1996) 12 Cal.4th 854.</p> <p>(5) If the lead agency determines that a mitigation measure cannot be legally imposed, the measure need not be proposed or analyzed. Instead, the EIR may simply reference that fact and briefly explain the reasons underlying the lead agency's determination.</p>	
16. The management programs will establish environmental and social Action Plans, ²¹ which will	15097. MITIGATION MONITORING OR REPORTING.	PS1 establishes specific requirements for its environmental and social Action Plans.

²¹ Action plans may include an overall Environmental and Social Action Plan necessary for carrying out a suite of mitigation measures or thematic action plans, such as Resettlement Action Plans or Biodiversity Action Plans. Action plans may be plans designed to fill in the gaps of existing management programs to ensure consistency with the Performance Standards, or they may be stand alone plans that specify the project's mitigation strategy.

A Comparison of IFC Performance Standard 1 and the California Environmental Quality Act

<p>define desired outcomes and actions to address the issues raised in the risks and impacts identification process, as measurable events to the extent possible, with elements such as performance indicators, targets, or acceptance criteria that can be tracked over defined time periods, and with estimates of the resources and responsibilities for implementation. As appropriate, the management program will recognize and incorporate the role of relevant actions and events controlled by third parties to address identified risks and impacts. Recognizing the dynamic nature of the project, the management program will be responsive to changes in circumstances, unforeseen events, and the results of monitoring and review.</p>	<p>(c) The public agency may choose whether its program will monitor mitigation, report on mitigation, or both. "Reporting" generally consists of a written compliance review that is presented to the decision making body or authorized staff person. A report may be required at various stages during project implementation or upon completion of the mitigation measure. "Monitoring" is generally an ongoing or periodic process of project oversight. There is often no clear distinction between monitoring and reporting and the program best suited to ensuring compliance in any given instance will usually involve elements of both. The choice of program may be guided by the following:</p> <p>(1) Reporting is suited to projects which have readily measurable or quantitative mitigation measures or which already involve regular review. For example, a report may be required upon issuance of final occupancy to a project whose mitigation measures were confirmed by building inspection.</p> <p>(2) Monitoring is suited to projects with complex mitigation measures, such as wetlands restoration or archeological protection, which may exceed the expertise of the local agency to oversee, are expected to be implemented over a period of time, or require careful implementation to assure compliance.</p> <p>(3) Reporting and monitoring are suited to all but the most simple projects. Monitoring ensures that project compliance is checked on a regular basis during and, if necessary after, implementation. Reporting ensures that the approving agency is informed of compliance with mitigation requirements.</p> <p>15097. MITIGATION MONITORING OR REPORTING.</p> <p>(e) At its discretion, an agency may adopt standardized policies and requirements to guide individually adopted monitoring or reporting programs. Standardized policies and requirements may describe, but are not limited to:</p> <p>(1) The relative responsibilities of various departments within the agency for various aspects of monitoring or reporting, including lead responsibility for administering typical</p>	<p>CEQA does not specifically identify the creation of "Action Plans" as mitigation, nor does it provide ideas for content. However, CEQA does provide project proponents the ability to develop mitigation monitoring and/or reporting programs. These programs could be structured to correspond directly to the specific requirements under PS1. This can include provisions for addressing impacts of third parties, changes in circumstances, unforeseen events, and results of monitoring.</p>
---	--	---

The "Action plan" terminology is understood by some communities of practice to mean Management plans, or Development plans. In this case, examples are numerous and include various types of environmental and social management plans.

A Comparison of IFC Performance Standard 1 and the California Environmental Quality Act

	<p>programs and support responsibilities.</p> <p>(2) The responsibilities of the project proponent.</p> <p>(3) Agency guidelines for preparing monitoring or reporting programs.</p> <p>(4) General standards for determining project compliance with the mitigation measures or revisions and related conditions of approval.</p> <p>(5) Enforcement procedures for noncompliance, including provisions for administrative appeal.</p> <p>(6) Process for informing staff and decision makers of the relative success of mitigation measures and using those results to improve future mitigation measures.</p>	
<p>17. The client, in collaboration with appropriate and relevant third parties, will establish, maintain, and strengthen as necessary an organizational structure that defines roles, responsibilities, and authority to implement the ESMS. Specific personnel, including management representative(s), with clear lines of responsibility and authority should be designated. Key environmental and social responsibilities should be well defined and communicated to the relevant personnel and to the rest of the client's organization. Sufficient management sponsorship and human and financial resources will be provided on an ongoing basis to achieve effective and continuous environmental and social performance.</p>	<p>15097. MITIGATION MONITORING OR REPORTING.</p> <p>(d) Lead and responsible agencies should coordinate their mitigation monitoring or reporting programs where possible. Generally, lead and responsible agencies for a given project will adopt separate and different monitoring or reporting programs. This occurs because of any of the following reasons: the agencies have adopted and are responsible for reporting on or monitoring different mitigation measures; the agencies are deciding on the project at different times; each agency has the discretion to choose its own approach to monitoring or reporting; and each agency has its own special expertise.</p>	<p>PS1 requires that the roles, responsibilities, and authority to implement the ESMS be specifically defined. PS1 also explicitly requires that there be sufficient management sponsorship on an ongoing basis to achieve performance. CEQA is not as explicit in its direction with regard to mitigation monitoring and reporting, although it does require that agencies coordinate their efforts and clearly identify what each agency should do. As stated above, CEQA provides the flexibility to create a monitoring and reporting program that corresponds directly to the requirements of PS1.</p>
<p>18. Personnel within the client's organization with direct responsibility for the project's environmental and social performance will have the knowledge, skills, and experience necessary to perform their work, including current knowledge of the host country's regulatory requirements and the applicable requirements of Performance Standards 1 through 8. Personnel will also possess the knowledge, skills, and experience to implement the specific measures and actions required under the ESMS and the methods required to perform the actions in a competent and efficient manner.</p>	<p>15149. USE OF REGISTERED PROFESSIONALS IN PREPARING EIRS</p> <p>(a) A number of statutes provide that certain professional services can be provided to the public only by individuals who have been registered by a registration board established under California law. Such statutory restrictions apply to a number of professions including but not limited to engineering, land surveying, forestry, geology, and geophysics.</p> <p>(b) In its intended usage, an EIR is not a technical document that can be prepared only by a registered professional. The EIR serves as a public disclosure document explaining the</p>	<p>PS1 requires a certain level of professional knowledge and experience to perform the work and implement the ESMS. CEQA does not specifically require any level of expertise to prepare an EIR or to manage a mitigation monitoring effort. However, CEQA guidance does note that technical studies cited by an EIR may need to be completed by registered professionals, depending on state statutes. Additionally, CEQA assumes that the expertise of the</p>

A Comparison of IFC Performance Standard 1 and the California Environmental Quality Act

	<p>effects of the proposed project on the environment, alternatives to the project, and ways to minimize adverse effects and to increase beneficial effects. As a result of information in the EIR, the Lead Agency should establish requirements or conditions on project design, construction, or operation in order to protect or enhance the environment. State statutes may provide that only registered professionals can prepare technical studies which will be used in or which will control the detailed design, construction, or operation of the proposed project and which will be prepared in support of an EIR.</p> <p>15097. MITIGATION MONITORING OR REPORTING. (d) Lead and responsible agencies should coordinate their mitigation monitoring or reporting programs where possible. Generally, lead and responsible agencies for a given project will adopt separate and different monitoring or reporting programs. This occurs because of any of the following reasons: the agencies have adopted and are responsible for reporting on or monitoring different mitigation measures; the agencies are deciding on the project at different times; each agency has the discretion to choose its own approach to monitoring or reporting; and each agency has its own special expertise.</p>	<p>agency will dictate its role in mitigation monitoring and/or reporting.</p>
<p>19. The process of identification of risks and impacts will consist of an adequate, accurate, and objective evaluation and presentation, prepared by competent professionals. For projects posing potentially significant adverse impacts or where technically complex issues are involved, clients may be required to involve external experts to assist in the risks and impacts identification process.</p>	<p>15151. STANDARDS FOR ADEQUACY OF AN EIR An EIR should be prepared with a sufficient degree of analysis to provide decision makers with information which enables them to make a decision which intelligently takes account of environmental consequences. An evaluation of the environmental effects of a proposed project need not be exhaustive, but the sufficiency of an EIR is to be reviewed in the light of what is reasonably feasible. Disagreement among experts does not make an EIR inadequate, but the EIR should summarize the main points of disagreement among the experts. The courts have looked not for perfection but for adequacy, completeness, and a good faith effort at full disclosure.</p> <p>15149. USE OF REGISTERED PROFESSIONALS IN PREPARING EIRS (b) In its intended usage, an EIR is not a technical document that can be prepared only by a registered professional. The EIR serves as a public disclosure document explaining the</p>	<p>PS1 requires an objective evaluation of project risks and impacts to be prepared by competent professionals. CEQA also requires an objective evaluation and a level of detail that intelligently takes account of environmental consequences. CEQA is not as specific regarding the level of technical experience needed to complete an EIR. In fact, EIRs are not considered technical documents that can only be prepared by a registered professional. However, CEQA guidance notes that technical studies cited by an EIR may need to be completed by registered professionals, depending on state statutes.</p>

A Comparison of IFC Performance Standard 1 and the California Environmental Quality Act

	effects of the proposed project on the environment, alternatives to the project, and ways to minimize adverse effects and to increase beneficial effects. As a result of information in the EIR, the Lead Agency should establish requirements or conditions on project design, construction, or operation in order to protect or enhance the environment. State statutes may provide that only registered professionals can prepare technical studies which will be used in or which will control the detailed design, construction, or operation of the proposed project and which will be prepared in support of an EIR.	
20. Where the project involves specifically identified physical elements, aspects and facilities that are likely to generate impacts, the ESMS will establish and maintain an emergency preparedness and response system so that the client, in collaboration with appropriate and relevant third parties, will be prepared to respond to accidental and emergency situations associated with the project in a manner appropriate to prevent and mitigate any harm to people and/or the environment. This preparation will include the identification of areas where accidents and emergency situations may occur, communities and individuals that may be impacted, response procedures, provision of equipment and resources, designation of responsibilities, communication, including that with potentially Affected Communities and periodic training to ensure effective response. The emergency preparedness and response activities will be periodically reviewed and revised, as necessary, to reflect changing conditions.	<p>APPENDIX G. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM.</p> <p>The explanation of each issue should identify:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance <p>VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? 	<p>PS1 requires that the SMS establish and maintain an emergency preparedness and response system, including a description of where accidents may occur. As stated above, CEQA does not require a formal section on emergency preparedness. Impacts to emergency response service providers and infrastructure are typically analyzed in EIRs per CEQA guidance. Depending on the complexity of the effect, the impact discussion in an EIR may specifically mention those issues highlighted by PS1.</p>
21. Where applicable, the client will also assist and collaborate with the potentially Affected Communities (see Performance Standard 4) and the local government agencies in their preparations to respond effectively to emergency situations, especially when their participation and collaboration	<p>APPENDIX G. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM.</p> <p>The explanation of each issue should identify:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance 	<p>As stated above, CEQA does not require a formal section on emergency preparedness and/or impacts to emergency response. However, impacts to public health, hazardous materials, and emergency response infrastructure are</p>

A Comparison of IFC Performance Standard 1 and the California Environmental Quality Act

<p>are necessary to ensure effective response. If local government agencies have little or no capacity to respond effectively, the client will play an active role in preparing for and responding to emergencies associated with the project. The client will document its emergency preparedness and response activities, resources, and responsibilities, and will provide appropriate information to potentially Affected Community and relevant government agencies.</p>	<p>VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:</p> <p>a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</p> <p>b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?</p> <p>c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</p> <p>d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?</p> <p>g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</p> <p>15126.4 CONSIDERATION AND DISCUSSION OF MITIGATION MEASURES PROPOSED TO MINIMIZE SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS.</p> <p>(a) Mitigation Measures in General.</p> <p>(1) An EIR shall describe feasible measures which could minimize significant adverse impacts, including where relevant, inefficient and unnecessary consumption of energy.</p> <p>(A) The discussion of mitigation measures shall distinguish between the measures which are proposed by project proponents to be included in the project and other measures proposed by the lead, responsible or trustee agency or other persons which are not included but the lead agency determines could reasonably be expected to reduce adverse impacts if required as conditions of approving the project. This discussion shall identify mitigation measures for each significant environmental effect identified in the EIR.</p>	<p>typically analyzed in EIRs per CEQA guidance. Depending on the significance of the impact, CEQA allows for mitigation measures to be developed in an EIR that call for the items specifically noted in PS1, including collaborating with communities to assure effective emergency response.</p>
<p>22. The client will establish procedures to monitor and measure the effectiveness of the management program, as well as compliance with any related legal and/or contractual obligations and regulatory requirements. Where the government or other third party has responsibility for managing specific risks</p>	<p>15097. MITIGATION MONITORING OR REPORTING.</p> <p>(a) This section applies when a public agency has made the findings required under paragraph (1) of subdivision (a) of Section 15091 relative to an EIR or adopted a mitigated negative declaration in conjunction with approving a project. In order to ensure that the mitigation measures and project</p>	<p>PS1 requires that the project proponent develop procedures that monitor the effectiveness of the ESMS. It also suggests involving affected community members and agencies. PS1 specifically states that the project proponent should</p>

A Comparison of IFC Performance Standard 1 and the California Environmental Quality Act

<p>and impacts and associated mitigation measures, the client will collaborate in establishing and monitoring such mitigation measures. Where appropriate, clients will consider involving representatives from Affected Communities to participate in monitoring activities.²² The client's monitoring program should be overseen by the appropriate level in the organization. For projects with significant impacts, the client will retain external experts to verify its monitoring information. The extent of monitoring should be commensurate with the project's environmental and social risks and impacts and with compliance requirements.</p>	<p>revisions identified in the EIR or negative declaration are implemented, the public agency shall adopt a program for monitoring or reporting on the revisions which it has required in the project and the measures it has imposed to mitigate or avoid significant environmental effects. A public agency may delegate reporting or monitoring responsibilities to another public agency or to a private entity which accepts the delegation; however, until mitigation measures have been completed the lead agency remains responsible for ensuring that implementation of the mitigation measures occurs in accordance with the program.</p> <p>(e) At its discretion, an agency may adopt standardized policies and requirements to guide individually adopted monitoring or reporting programs. Standardized policies and requirements may describe, but are not limited to:</p> <p>(1) The relative responsibilities of various departments within the agency for various aspects of monitoring or reporting, including lead responsibility for administering typical programs and support responsibilities.</p> <p>(2) The responsibilities of the project proponent.</p> <p>(3) Agency guidelines for preparing monitoring or reporting programs.</p> <p>(4) General standards for determining project compliance with the mitigation measures or revisions and related conditions of approval.</p> <p>(5) Enforcement procedures for noncompliance, including provisions for administrative appeal.</p> <p>(6) Process for informing staff and decision makers of the relative success of mitigation measures and using those results to improve future mitigation measures.</p>	<p>retain external experts to verify its monitoring information if the project has significant impacts. Mitigation monitoring and reporting guidance under CEQA is not as specific as PS1. However, CEQA provides ample flexibility for project proponents to develop mitigation monitoring and reporting programs that track effectiveness of the various mitigation measures and project compliance. Furthermore, CEQA provides flexibility for project proponents to include community members and other agencies in the mitigation monitoring program, as well as the flexibility to define overall standards and enforcement procedures. An important difference under CEQA is that in most cases once mitigation measures are deemed accomplished, requirements of the project cease.</p>
<p>23. In addition to recording information to track performance and establishing relevant operational controls, the client should use dynamic mechanisms, such as internal inspections and audits, where relevant, to verify compliance and progress toward the desired outcomes. Monitoring will normally include recording information to track performance and comparing this against the previously established benchmarks or requirements</p>	<p>15097. MITIGATION MONITORING OR REPORTING.</p> <p>(e) At its discretion, an agency may adopt standardized policies and requirements to guide individually adopted monitoring or reporting programs. Standardized policies and requirements may describe, but are not limited to:</p> <p>(1) The relative responsibilities of various departments within the agency for various aspects of monitoring or reporting, including lead responsibility for administering typical programs and support responsibilities.</p>	<p>PS1 requires that information recording, internal audits, inspections, etc., be used to inform the management program. PS1 states that the management program should be able to be adjusted based on the results of these internal reporting mechanisms. Mitigation monitoring and reporting guidance under CEQA is not as specific as PS1. However, CEQA</p>

²² For example, participatory water monitoring.

A Comparison of IFC Performance Standard 1 and the California Environmental Quality Act

in the management program. Monitoring should be adjusted according to performance experience and actions requested by relevant regulatory authorities. The client will document monitoring results and identify and reflect the necessary corrective and preventive actions in the amended management program and plans. The client, in collaboration with appropriate and relevant third parties, will implement these corrective and preventive actions, and follow up on these actions in upcoming monitoring cycles to ensure their effectiveness.	<p>(2) The responsibilities of the project proponent.</p> <p>(3) Agency guidelines for preparing monitoring or reporting programs.</p> <p>(4) General standards for determining project compliance with the mitigation measures or revisions and related conditions of approval.</p> <p>(5) Enforcement procedures for noncompliance, including provisions for administrative appeal.</p> <p>(6) Process for informing staff and decision makers of the relative success of mitigation measures and using those results to improve future mitigation measures.</p>	provides ample flexibility for project proponents to develop mitigation monitoring and reporting programs that include internal audits, etc., and include requirements that programs can be adjusted based on new information.
24. Senior management in the client organization will receive periodic performance reviews of the effectiveness of the ESMS, based on systematic data collection and analysis. The scope and frequency of such reporting will depend upon the nature and scope of the activities identified and undertaken in accordance with the client's ESMS and other applicable project requirements. Based on results within these performance reviews, senior management will take the necessary and appropriate steps to ensure the intent of the client's policy is met, that procedures, practices, and plans are being implemented, and are seen to be effective.	<p>15097. MITIGATION MONITORING OR REPORTING.</p> <p>(c) The public agency may choose whether its program will monitor mitigation, report on mitigation, or both. "Reporting" generally consists of a written compliance review that is presented to the decision making body or authorized staff person. A report may be required at various stages during project implementation or upon completion of the mitigation measure. "Monitoring" is generally an ongoing or periodic process of project oversight. There is often no clear distinction between monitoring and reporting and the program best suited to ensuring compliance in any given instance will usually involve elements of both. The choice of program may be guided by the following:</p> <p>(1) Reporting is suited to projects which have readily measurable or quantitative mitigation measures or which already involve regular review. For example, a report may be required upon issuance of final occupancy to a project whose mitigation measures were confirmed by building inspection.</p> <p>(3) Reporting and monitoring are suited to all but the most simple projects. Monitoring ensures that project compliance is checked on a regular basis during and, if necessary after, implementation. Reporting ensures that the approving agency is informed of compliance with mitigation requirements.</p>	PS1 requires that project proponent management be involved and aware of project performance, and that senior management is able to change the program based on this information. Again, mitigation monitoring and reporting guidance under CEQA is not as specific as PS1. However, CEQA provides ample flexibility for project proponents to develop mitigation monitoring and reporting programs that include senior review and opportunities to make changes in the program.
25. Stakeholder engagement is the basis for building strong, constructive, and responsive relationships that are essential for the successful	<p>15200. PURPOSES OF REVIEW</p> <p>The purposes of review of EIRs and Negative Declarations include:</p>	PS1 stresses the involvement of multiple stakeholders throughout a project's development. The PS1 guidance

A Comparison of IFC Performance Standard 1 and the California Environmental Quality Act

<p>management of a project's environmental and social impacts.²³ Stakeholder engagement is an ongoing process that may involve, in varying degrees, the following elements: stakeholder analysis and planning, disclosure and dissemination of information, consultation and participation, grievance mechanism, and ongoing reporting to Affected Communities. The nature, frequency, and level of effort of stakeholder engagement may vary considerably and will be commensurate with the project's risks and adverse impacts, and the project's phase of development.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Sharing expertise, (b) Disclosing agency analyses, (c) Checking for accuracy, (d) Detecting omissions, (e) Discovering public concerns, and (f) Soliciting counter proposals. <p>15201. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION Public participation is an essential part of the CEQA process. Each public agency should include provisions in its CEQA procedures for wide public involvement, formal and informal, consistent with its existing activities and procedures, in order to receive and evaluate public reactions to environmental issues related to the agency's activities. Such procedures should include, whenever possible, making environmental information available in electronic format on the Internet, on a web site maintained or utilized by the public agency.</p> <p>15083. EARLY PUBLIC CONSULTATION Prior to completing the draft EIR, the Lead Agency may also consult directly with any person or organization it believes will be concerned with the environmental effects of the project. Many public agencies have found that early consultation solves many potential problems that would arise in more serious forms later in the review process. This early consultation may be called scoping. Scoping will be necessary when preparing an EIR/EIS jointly with a federal agency.</p> <p>15202. PUBLIC HEARINGS (a) CEQA does not require formal hearings at any stage of the environmental review process. Public comments may be restricted to written communication. (b) If an agency provides a public hearing on its decision to carry out or approve a project, the agency should include environmental review as one of the subjects for the hearing. (c) A public hearing on the environmental impact of a project should usually be held when the Lead Agency determines it would facilitate the purposes and goals of CEQA to do so.</p>	<p>provides example elements of engagement processes. The public involvement requirements of CEQA are not as fully developed as those in PS1. However, CEQA guidelines do state that participation by the public is an "essential part of the CEQA process." CEQA guidelines provide project proponents with the opportunity to consult with the public and involve stakeholders in the process as much as they see fit. The level of engagement called for in PS1, however, is typically beyond the scope of engagement efforts seen for an EIR. CEQA guidelines <i>require</i> relatively limited stakeholder engagement (particularly with the general public). Minor modifications of the process will ensure that the process meets IFC standards.</p>
--	--	---

²³ Requirements regarding engagement of workers and related grievance redress procedures are found in Performance Standard 2.

A Comparison of IFC Performance Standard 1 and the California Environmental Quality Act

	<p>The hearing may be held in conjunction with and as a part of normal planning activities.</p> <p>(d) A draft EIR or Negative Declaration should be used as a basis for discussion at a public hearing. The hearing may be held at a place where public hearings are regularly conducted by the Lead Agency or at another location expected to be convenient to the public.</p> <p>(e) Notice of all public hearings shall be given in a timely manner. This notice may be given in the same form and time as notice for other regularly conducted public hearings of the public agency. To the extent that the public agency maintains an Internet web site, notice of all public hearings should be made available in electronic format on that site.</p> <p>(f) A public agency may include, in its implementing procedures, procedures for the conducting of public hearings pursuant to this section. The procedures may adopt existing notice and hearing requirements of the public agency for regularly conducted legislative, planning, and other activities.</p> <p>(g) There is no requirement for a public agency to conduct a public hearing in connection with its review of an EIR prepared by another public agency.</p>	
<p>26. Clients should identify the range of stakeholders that may be interested in their actions and consider how external communications might facilitate a dialog with all stakeholders (paragraph 34 below). Where projects involve specifically identified physical elements, aspects and/or facilities that are likely to generate adverse environmental and social impacts to Affected Communities the client will identify the Affected Communities and will meet the relevant requirements described below.</p>	<p>§ 21083.9. SCOPING MEETINGS</p> <p>(a) Notwithstanding Section 21080.4, 21104, or 21153, a lead agency shall call at least one scoping meeting for either of the following:</p> <p>(1) A proposed project that may affect highways or other facilities under the jurisdiction of the Department of Transportation if the meeting is requested by the department. The lead agency shall call the scoping meeting as soon as possible, but not later than 30 days after receiving the request from the Department of Transportation.</p> <p>(2) A project of statewide, regional, or areawide significance.</p> <p>(b) The lead agency shall provide notice of at least one scoping meeting held pursuant to paragraph (2) of subdivision (a) to all of the following:</p> <p>(1) A county or city that borders on a county or city within which the project is located, unless otherwise designated annually by agreement between the lead agency and the county or city.</p> <p>(2) A responsible agency.</p> <p>(3) A public agency that has jurisdiction by law with respect</p>	<p>PS1 requires project proponents to identify those populations who may be affected by the proposed project and to engage with them. As stated above, the public involvement requirements of CEQA are not as fully developed as those in PS1. However, CEQA guidelines do state that participation by the public is an “essential part of the CEQA process” and that the lead agency may identify potentially affected populations early in the CEQA process with whom they can meet. CEQA guidelines stress that some benefit may come from early engagement with these stakeholders. CEQA guidelines provide project proponents with the opportunity to consult with the public and involve stakeholders in the process as much as they see fit. The level of engagement called for in PS1, however, is typically beyond the scope of</p>

A Comparison of IFC Performance Standard 1 and the California Environmental Quality Act

	<p>to the project.</p> <p>(4) A transportation planning agency or public agency required to be consulted pursuant to Section 21092.4.</p> <p>(5) A public agency, organization or individual who has filed a written request for the notice.</p> <p>15083. EARLY PUBLIC CONSULTATION</p> <p>Prior to completing the draft EIR, the Lead Agency may also consult directly with any person or organization it believes will be concerned with the environmental effects of the project. Many public agencies have found that early consultation solves many potential problems that would arise in more serious forms later in the review process. This early consultation may be called scoping. Scoping will be necessary when preparing an EIR/EIS jointly with a federal agency.</p> <p>15086. CONSULTATION CONCERNING DRAFT EIR</p> <p>(b) The lead agency may consult directly with:</p> <p>(3) Any person identified by the applicant whom the applicant believes will be concerned with the environmental effects of the project.</p>	<p>engagement efforts seen for an EIR. CEQA guidelines <i>require</i> relatively limited stakeholder engagement (particularly with the general public). Under certain limited circumstances CEQA requires a public scoping meeting in the early stages of environmental analysis. Thus, minor modifications can meet the goals of the IFC standards.</p>
<p>27. The client will develop and implement a Stakeholder Engagement Plan that is scaled to the project risks and impacts and development stage, and be tailored to the characteristics and interests of the Affected Communities. Where applicable, the Stakeholder Engagement Plan will include differentiated measures to allow the effective participation of those identified as disadvantaged or vulnerable. When the stakeholder engagement process depends substantially on community representatives,²⁴ the client will make every reasonable effort to verify that such persons do in fact represent the views of Affected Communities and that they can be relied upon to faithfully communicate the results of consultations to their constituents.</p>	<p>15083. EARLY PUBLIC CONSULTATION</p> <p>Prior to completing the draft EIR, the Lead Agency may also consult directly with any person or organization it believes will be concerned with the environmental effects of the project. Many public agencies have found that early consultation solves many potential problems that would arise in more serious forms later in the review process. This early consultation may be called scoping. Scoping will be necessary when preparing an EIR/EIS jointly with a federal agency.</p> <p>(a) Scoping has been helpful to agencies in identifying the range of actions, alternatives, mitigation measures, and significant effects to be analyzed in depth in an EIR and in eliminating from detailed study issues found not to be important.</p> <p>(b) Scoping has been found to be an effective way to bring</p>	<p>PS1 requires the development of a plan that formalizes the engagement process and is tailored to the characteristics and interests of the potentially affected population, including disadvantaged or vulnerable populations. As stated above, the public involvement requirements of CEQA are not as fully developed as those in PS1. However, CEQA guidelines do state that participation by the public is an “essential part of the CEQA process.” CEQA guidelines provide project proponents with the opportunity to consult with the public and involve stakeholders in the process as much as they see fit; CEQA does not limit a lead agency as to how populations may be identified or how</p>

²⁴ For example, community and religious leaders, local government representatives, civil society representatives, politicians, school teachers, and/or others representing one or more affected stakeholder groups.

A Comparison of IFC Performance Standard 1 and the California Environmental Quality Act

	<p>together and resolve the concerns of affected federal, state, and local agencies, the proponent of the action, and other interested persons including those who might not be in accord with the action on environmental grounds.</p> <p>15201. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION Public participation is an essential part of the CEQA process. Each public agency should include provisions in its CEQA procedures for wide public involvement, formal and informal, consistent with its existing activities and procedures, in order to receive and evaluate public reactions to environmental issues related to the agency's activities. Such procedures should include, whenever possible, making environmental information available in electronic format on the Internet, on a web site maintained or utilized by the public agency.</p> <p>15202. PUBLIC HEARINGS (a) CEQA does not require formal hearings at any stage of the environmental review process. Public comments may be restricted to written communication.</p> <p>15086. CONSULTATION CONCERNING DRAFT EIR (b) The lead agency may consult directly with: (3) Any person identified by the applicant whom the applicant believes will be concerned with the environmental effects of the project.</p>	<p>they are engaged. The level of engagement called for in PS1, however, is typically beyond the scope of engagement efforts seen for an EIR. CEQA guidelines <i>require</i> relatively limited stakeholder engagement (particularly with the general public).</p>
<p>28. In cases where the exact location of the project is not known, but it is reasonably expected to have significant impacts on local communities, the client will prepare a Stakeholder Engagement Framework, as part of its management program, outlining general principles and a strategy to identify Affected Communities and other relevant stakeholders and plan for an engagement process compatible with this Performance Standard that will be implemented once the physical location of the project is known.</p>	<p>15083. EARLY PUBLIC CONSULTATION Prior to completing the draft EIR, the Lead Agency may also consult directly with any person or organization it believes will be concerned with the environmental effects of the project. Many public agencies have found that early consultation solves many potential problems that would arise in more serious forms later in the review process. This early consultation may be called scoping. Scoping will be necessary when preparing an EIR/EIS jointly with a federal agency.</p> <p>15086. CONSULTATION CONCERNING DRAFT EIR (b) The lead agency may consult directly with: (3) Any person identified by the applicant whom the applicant believes will be concerned with the environmental effects of the project.</p>	<p>PS1 requires a project proponent to prepare a Stakeholder Engagement Framework even in those instances where the exact location of the project is not known. As stated above, the public involvement requirements of CEQA are not as fully developed as those in PS1. However, CEQA guidelines do state that participation by the public is an "essential part of the CEQA process." CEQA guidelines provide project proponents with the opportunity to consult with the public and involve stakeholders in the process as much as they see fit; CEQA does not limit a lead agency as to how populations may be identified, how they are engaged, or when in the process</p>

A Comparison of IFC Performance Standard 1 and the California Environmental Quality Act

		these populations may be engaged. The level of engagement called for in PS1, however, is typically beyond the scope of engagement efforts seen for an EIR. CEQA guidelines <i>require</i> relatively limited stakeholder engagement (particularly with the general public).
29. Disclosure of relevant project information helps Affected Communities and other stakeholders understand the risks, impacts and opportunities of the project. The client will provide Affected Communities with access to relevant information ²⁵ on: (i) the purpose, nature, and scale of the project; (ii) the duration of proposed project activities; (iii) any risks to and potential impacts on such communities and relevant mitigation measures; (iv) the envisaged stakeholder engagement process; and (v) the grievance mechanism.	<p>§ 21083.9. SCOPING MEETINGS</p> <p>(a) Notwithstanding Section 21080.4, 21104, or 21153, a lead agency shall call at least one scoping meeting for either of the following:</p> <p>(1) A proposed project that may affect highways or other facilities under the jurisdiction of the Department of Transportation if the meeting is requested by the department. The lead agency shall call the scoping meeting as soon as possible, but not later than 30 days after receiving the request from the Department of Transportation.</p> <p>(2) A project of statewide, regional, or areawide significance.</p> <p>15201. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION</p> <p>Public participation is an essential part of the CEQA process. Each public agency should include provisions in its CEQA procedures for wide public involvement, formal and informal, consistent with its existing activities and procedures, in order to receive and evaluate public reactions to environmental issues related to the agency's activities. Such procedures should include, whenever possible, making environmental information available in electronic format on the Internet, on a web site maintained or utilized by the public agency.</p> <p>15202. PUBLIC HEARINGS</p> <p>(a) CEQA does not require formal hearings at any stage of the environmental review process. Public comments may be restricted to written communication.</p> <p>(b) If an agency provides a public hearing on its decision to carry out or approve a project, the agency should include environmental review as one of the subjects for the hearing.</p>	<p>PS1 requires disclosure of relevant project information regarding a series of project-related issue areas. Under CEQA, as stated above, some of this information can be transmitted through elective early engagement and/or public hearings. CEQA does require formal disclosure of PS1 #29 items (i)-(iii) through its public participation guidance and the formal EIR document review process, which requires adequate public notice and an opportunity for the public to comment on significant environmental issues. Depending on the complexity of the stakeholder engagement process for a project, the public may have an opportunity to comment if details are present in the Draft EIR. Grievance mechanisms are not required under CEQA. Members of the public with significant concerns concerning the level of environmental analysis present in the Draft EIR may submit a comment that must be addressed by the lead agency; however, more complex grievances (or grievances occurring after the certification of the EIR) are not accommodated by the CEQA process. For projects in California with CEQA review, the Judicial Branch of California is the forum for grievances.</p>

²⁵ Depending on the scale of the project and significance of the risks and impacts, relevant document(s) could range from full Environmental and Social Assessments and Action Plans (i.e., Stakeholder Engagement Plan, Resettlement Action Plans, Biodiversity Action Plans, Hazardous Materials Management Plans, Emergency Preparedness and Response Plans, Community Health and Safety Plans, Ecosystem Restoration Plans, and Indigenous Peoples Development Plans, etc.) to easy-to-understand summaries of key issues and commitments. These documents could also include the client's environmental and social policy and any supplemental measures and actions defined as a result of independent due diligence conducted by financiers.

A Comparison of IFC Performance Standard 1 and the California Environmental Quality Act

	<p>(c) A public hearing on the environmental impact of a project should usually be held when the Lead Agency determines it would facilitate the purposes and goals of CEQA to do so. The hearing may be held in conjunction with and as a part of normal planning activities.</p> <p>(d) A draft EIR or Negative Declaration should be used as a basis for discussion at a public hearing. The hearing may be held at a place where public hearings are regularly conducted by the Lead Agency or at another location expected to be convenient to the public.</p> <p>(e) Notice of all public hearings shall be given in a timely manner. This notice may be given in the same form and time as notice for other regularly conducted public hearings of the public agency. To the extent that the public agency maintains an Internet web site, notice of all public hearings should be made available in electronic format on that site.</p> <p>(f) A public agency may include, in its implementing procedures, procedures for the conducting of public hearings pursuant to this section. The procedures may adopt existing notice and hearing requirements of the public agency for regularly conducted legislative, planning, and other activities.</p> <p>(g) There is no requirement for a public agency to conduct a public hearing in connection with its review of an EIR prepared by another public agency.</p> <p>15087. PUBLIC REVIEW OF DRAFT EIR</p> <p>(a) The lead agency shall provide public notice of the availability of a draft EIR at the same time it sends a notice of completion to the Office of Planning and Research. ... Notice shall be mailed to the last known name and address of all organizations and individuals who have previously requested such notice in writing, and shall also be given by at least one of the following procedures:</p> <p>(1) Publication at least one time by the public agency in a newspaper of general circulation in the area affected by the proposed project. If more than one area is affected, the notice shall be published in the newspaper of largest circulation from among the newspapers of general circulation in those areas.</p> <p>(2) Posting of notice by the public agency on and off the site in the area where the project is to be located.</p>	
--	--	--

A Comparison of IFC Performance Standard 1 and the California Environmental Quality Act

	(3) Direct mailing to the owners and occupants of property contiguous to the parcel or parcels on which the project is located. Owners of such property shall be identified as shown on the latest equalized assessment roll.	
<p>30. When Affected Communities are subject to identified risks and adverse impacts from a project, the client will undertake a process of consultation in a manner that provides the Affected Communities with opportunities to express their views on project risks, impacts and mitigation measures, and allows the client to consider and respond to them. The extent and degree of engagement required by the consultation process should be commensurate with the project's risks and adverse impacts and with the concerns raised by the Affected Communities. Effective consultation is a two-way process that should: (i) begin early in the process of identification of environmental and social risks and impacts and continue on an ongoing basis as risks and impacts arise; (ii) be based on the prior disclosure and dissemination of relevant, transparent, objective, meaningful and easily accessible information which is in a culturally appropriate local language(s) and format and is understandable to Affected Communities; (iii) focus inclusive²⁶ engagement on those directly affected as opposed to those not directly affected; (iv) be free of external manipulation, interference, coercion, or intimidation; (v) enable meaningful participation, where applicable; and (vi) be documented. The client will tailor its consultation process to the language preferences of the Affected Communities, their decision-making process, and the needs of disadvantaged or vulnerable groups. If clients have already engaged in such a process, they will provide adequate documented evidence of such engagement.</p>	<p>15201. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION Public participation is an essential part of the CEQA process. Each public agency should include provisions in its CEQA procedures for wide public involvement, formal and informal, consistent with its existing activities and procedures, in order to receive and evaluate public reactions to environmental issues related to the agency's activities. Such procedures should include, whenever possible, making environmental information available in electronic format on the Internet, on a web site maintained or utilized by the public agency.</p> <p>15086. CONSULTATION CONCERNING DRAFT EIR (b) The lead agency may consult directly with: (3) Any person identified by the applicant whom the applicant believes will be concerned with the environmental effects of the project.</p> <p>15202. PUBLIC HEARINGS (a) CEQA does not require formal hearings at any stage of the environmental review process. Public comments may be restricted to written communication. (b) If an agency provides a public hearing on its decision to carry out or approve a project, the agency should include environmental review as one of the subjects for the hearing. (c) A public hearing on the environmental impact of a project should usually be held when the Lead Agency determines it would facilitate the purposes and goals of CEQA to do so. The hearing may be held in conjunction with and as a part of normal planning activities. (d) A draft EIR or Negative Declaration should be used as a basis for discussion at a public hearing. The hearing may be held at a place where public hearings are regularly conducted by the Lead Agency or at another location expected to be convenient to the public. (e) Notice of all public hearings shall be given in a timely</p>	<p>PS1 requires project proponents to conduct a consultation program that provides potentially affected populations with the opportunity to express their views on the project and allows the project proponent to consider and respond to them. As stated above, the public involvement requirements of CEQA are not as fully developed as those in PS1. However, CEQA guidelines provide project proponents with the opportunity to consult with the public and involve stakeholders in the process as much as they see fit; CEQA does not limit a lead agency as to how populations may be identified, how they are engaged, or how their comments may be addressed. CEQA does require a lead agency to provide access to the Draft EIR and an opportunity for the public to comment on the environmental analysis. These comments are addressed by the lead agency in the Final EIR and are kept on file.</p>

²⁶ Such as men, women, the elderly, youth, displaced persons, and vulnerable and disadvantaged persons or groups.

A Comparison of IFC Performance Standard 1 and the California Environmental Quality Act

	<p>manner. This notice may be given in the same form and time as notice for other regularly conducted public hearings of the public agency. To the extent that the public agency maintains an Internet web site, notice of all public hearings should be made available in electronic format on that site.</p> <p>(f) A public agency may include, in its implementing procedures, procedures for the conducting of public hearings pursuant to this section. The procedures may adopt existing notice and hearing requirements of the public agency for regularly conducted legislative, planning, and other activities.</p> <p>(g) There is no requirement for a public agency to conduct a public hearing in connection with its review of an EIR prepared by another public agency.</p> <p>15087. PUBLIC REVIEW OF DRAFT EIR</p> <p>(a) The lead agency shall provide public notice of the availability of a draft EIR at the same time it sends a notice of completion to the Office of Planning and Research. ... Notice shall be mailed to the last known name and address of all organizations and individuals who have previously requested such notice in writing, and shall also be given by at least one of the following procedures:</p> <p>(1) Publication at least one time by the public agency in a newspaper of general circulation in the area affected by the proposed project. If more than one area is affected, the notice shall be published in the newspaper of largest circulation from among the newspapers of general circulation in those areas.</p> <p>(2) Posting of notice by the public agency on and off the site in the area where the project is to be located.</p> <p>(3) Direct mailing to the owners and occupants of property contiguous to the parcel or parcels on which the project is located. Owners of such property shall be identified as shown on the latest equalized assessment roll.</p> <p>15203. ADEQUATE TIME FOR REVIEW AND COMMENT</p> <p>The Lead Agency shall provide adequate time for other public agencies and members of the public to review and comment on a draft EIR or Negative Declaration that it has prepared.</p> <p>(a) Public agencies may establish time periods for review in</p>	
--	---	--

A Comparison of IFC Performance Standard 1 and the California Environmental Quality Act

	<p>their implementing procedures and shall notify the public and reviewing agencies of the time for receipt of comments on EIRs. These time periods shall be consistent with applicable statutes, the State CEQA Guidelines, and applicable Clearinghouse review periods.</p> <p>(b) A review period for an EIR does not require a halt in other planning or evaluation activities related to a project. Planning should continue in conjunction with environmental evaluation.</p> <p>15208. RETENTION AND AVAILABILITY OF COMMENTS Comments received through the consultation process shall be retained for a reasonable period and available for public inspection at an address given in the final EIR. Comments which may be received on a draft EIR or Negative Declaration under preparation shall also be considered and kept on file.</p>	
<p>31. For projects with potentially significant adverse impacts on Affected Communities, the client will conduct an Informed Consultation and Participation (ICP) process that will build upon the steps outlined above in Consultation and will result in the Affected Communities' informed participation. ICP involves a more in-depth exchange of views and information, and an organized and iterative consultation, leading to the client's incorporating into their decision-making process the views of the Affected Communities on matters that affect them directly, such as the proposed mitigation measures, the sharing of development benefits and opportunities, and implementation issues. The consultation process should (i) capture both men's and women's views, if necessary through separate forums or engagements, and (ii) reflect men's and women's different concerns and priorities about impacts, mitigation mechanisms, and benefits, where appropriate. The client will document the process, in particular the measures taken to avoid or minimize risks to and adverse impacts on the Affected Communities, and will inform those affected about how their concerns have been considered.</p>	<p>15093. STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS (a) CEQA requires the decision-making agency to balance, as applicable, the economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits, including region-wide or statewide environmental benefits, of a proposed project against its unavoidable environmental risks when determining whether to approve the project. If the specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits, including region-wide or statewide environmental benefits, of a proposed project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, the adverse environmental effects may be considered "acceptable." (b) When the lead agency approves a project which will result in the occurrence of significant effects which are identified in the final EIR but are not avoided or substantially lessened, the agency shall state in writing the specific reasons to support its action based on the final EIR and/or other information in the record. The statement of overriding considerations shall be supported by substantial evidence in the record. (c) If an agency makes a statement of overriding considerations, the statement should be included in the record of the project approval and should be mentioned in the notice of determination. This statement does not substitute for, and shall be in addition to, findings required</p>	<p>In instances where significant adverse impacts are likely to occur, PS1 requires the development of an ICP that essentially increases the level of engagement with stakeholder groups and uses the results of the process to inform mitigation and minimization measures.</p> <p>CEQA requires that, in instances where a project is to be approved despite the identification of significant environmental impacts, the approving agency must make a statement of overriding considerations. This statement, which must be supported by factual records, must identify specific benefits derived from the project so as to make the significant adverse impacts "acceptable."</p> <p>As stated above, the public involvement requirements of CEQA are not as fully developed as those in PS1. CEQA guidelines provide project proponents with the opportunity to consult with the public and involve stakeholders in the process as much as they see fit; CEQA does not limit a lead agency as to how</p>

A Comparison of IFC Performance Standard 1 and the California Environmental Quality Act

	<p>pursuant to Section 15091.</p> <p>15201. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION Public participation is an essential part of the CEQA process. Each public agency should include provisions in its CEQA procedures for wide public involvement, formal and informal, consistent with its existing activities and procedures, in order to receive and evaluate public reactions to environmental issues related to the agency's activities. Such procedures should include, whenever possible, making environmental information available in electronic format on the Internet, on a web site maintained or utilized by the public agency.</p> <p>15202. PUBLIC HEARINGS (a) CEQA does not require formal hearings at any stage of the environmental review process. Public comments may be restricted to written communication. (b) If an agency provides a public hearing on its decision to carry out or approve a project, the agency should include environmental review as one of the subjects for the hearing. (c) A public hearing on the environmental impact of a project should usually be held when the Lead Agency determines it would facilitate the purposes and goals of CEQA to do so. The hearing may be held in conjunction with and as a part of normal planning activities. (d) A draft EIR or Negative Declaration should be used as a basis for discussion at a public hearing. The hearing may be held at a place where public hearings are regularly conducted by the Lead Agency or at another location expected to be convenient to the public. (e) Notice of all public hearings shall be given in a timely manner. This notice may be given in the same form and time as notice for other regularly conducted public hearings of the public agency. To the extent that the public agency maintains an Internet web site, notice of all public hearings should be made available in electronic format on that site. (f) A public agency may include, in its implementing procedures, procedures for the conducting of public hearings pursuant to this section. The procedures may adopt existing notice and hearing requirements of the public agency for regularly conducted legislative, planning, and other activities.</p>	<p>populations may be identified, how they are engaged, when they are engaged, and how their input may be incorporated into the environmental analysis.</p> <p>The level of engagement called for in PS1, however, is typically beyond the scope of engagement efforts seen for an EIR. CEQA guidelines <i>require</i> relatively limited stakeholder engagement (particularly with the general public).</p>
--	---	--

A Comparison of IFC Performance Standard 1 and the California Environmental Quality Act

	<p>(g) There is no requirement for a public agency to conduct a public hearing in connection with its review of an EIR prepared by another public agency.</p> <p>15203. ADEQUATE TIME FOR REVIEW AND COMMENT The Lead Agency shall provide adequate time for other public agencies and members of the public to review and comment on a draft EIR or Negative Declaration that it has prepared.</p> <p>(a) Public agencies may establish time periods for review in their implementing procedures and shall notify the public and reviewing agencies of the time for receipt of comments on EIRs. These time periods shall be consistent with applicable statutes, the State CEQA Guidelines, and applicable Clearinghouse review periods.</p> <p>(b) A review period for an EIR does not require a halt in other planning or evaluation activities related to a project. Planning should continue in conjunction with environmental evaluation.</p> <p>15208. RETENTION AND AVAILABILITY OF COMMENTS Comments received through the consultation process shall be retained for a reasonable period and available for public inspection at an address given in the final EIR. Comments which may be received on a draft EIR or Negative Declaration under preparation shall also be considered and kept on file.</p>	
<p>32. For projects with adverse impacts to Indigenous Peoples, the client is required to engage them in a process of ICP and in certain circumstances the client is required to obtain their Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC). The requirements related to Indigenous Peoples and the definition of the special circumstances requiring FPIC are described in Performance Standard 7.</p>	<p>15201. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION Public participation is an essential part of the CEQA process. Each public agency should include provisions in its CEQA procedures for wide public involvement, formal and informal, consistent with its existing activities and procedures, in order to receive and evaluate public reactions to environmental issues related to the agency's activities. Such procedures should include, whenever possible, making environmental information available in electronic format on the Internet, on a web site maintained or utilized by the public agency.</p> <p>15086. CONSULTATION CONCERNING DRAFT EIR (b) The lead agency may consult directly with: (3) Any person identified by the applicant whom the applicant believes will be concerned with the environmental effects of the project.</p>	<p>PS1 requires the project proponent to engage directly with Indigenous Peoples if they are potentially adversely affected by a proposed project. As stated above, the public involvement requirements of CEQA are not as fully developed as those in PS1. CEQA does not include any policies or guidelines regarding Indigenous Peoples. CEQA guidelines provide project proponents with the opportunity to consult with the public and involve stakeholders in the process as much as they see fit; CEQA does not limit a lead agency as to which populations may be involved.</p>

A Comparison of IFC Performance Standard 1 and the California Environmental Quality Act

		<p>It should be noted that Senate Bill 18 (Chapter 905, Statutes of 2004) requires cities and counties to contact and consult with California Native American tribes prior to amending or adopting any general plan or specific plan, or designating land as open space. In some cases, the general plan or specific plan process can require an EIR, in which case tribal consultation efforts would be described and disclosed as part of the CEQA process. Simple adaptation of this expectation to Georgian indigenous peoples would meet the expectations of PS1.</p>
<p>33. Where stakeholder engagement is the responsibility of the host government, the client will collaborate with the responsible government agency, to the extent permitted by the agency, to achieve outcomes that are consistent with the objectives of this Performance Standard. In addition, where government capacity is limited, the client will play an active role during the stakeholder engagement planning, implementation, and monitoring. If the process conducted by the government does not meet the relevant requirements of this Performance Standard, the client will conduct a complementary process and, where appropriate, identify supplemental actions.</p>	<p>15083. EARLY PUBLIC CONSULTATION Prior to completing the draft EIR, the Lead Agency may also consult directly with any person or organization it believes will be concerned with the environmental effects of the project. Many public agencies have found that early consultation solves many potential problems that would arise in more serious forms later in the review process. This early consultation may be called scoping. Scoping will be necessary when preparing an EIR/EIS jointly with a federal agency. (a) Scoping has been helpful to agencies in identifying the range of actions, alternatives, mitigation measures, and significant effects to be analyzed in depth in an EIR and in eliminating from detailed study issues found not to be important.</p>	<p>PS1 requires project proponents to be active in the outreach process even if stakeholder engagement is the responsibility of the government. CEQA is structured differently than PS1 and assumes that the lead government agency will direct the stakeholder engagement process. CEQA does not explicitly limit project proponent involvement in consultation or engagement, but it is also not required. In practice, project proponents are commonly involved in lead agency-sponsored stakeholder meetings.</p>
<p>34. Clients will implement and maintain a procedure for external communications that includes methods to (i) receive and register external communications from the public; (ii) screen and assess the issues raised and determine how to address them; (iii) provide, track, and document responses, if any; and (iv) adjust the management program, as appropriate. In addition, clients are encouraged to make publicly available periodic reports on their environmental and social sustainability.</p>	<p>15087. PUBLIC REVIEW OF DRAFT EIR (a) The lead agency shall provide public notice of the availability of a draft EIR at the same time it sends a notice of completion to the Office of Planning and Research. ... Notice shall be mailed to the last known name and address of all organizations and individuals who have previously requested such notice in writing, and shall also be given by at least one of the following procedures: (1) Publication at least one time by the public agency in a newspaper of general circulation in the area affected by the proposed project. If more than one area is affected, the</p>	<p>PS1 requires that project proponents implement and maintain a procedure to track and respond to public comments. CEQA guidance is similarly prescriptive, requiring the lead agency to provide access to the environmental document and provide the public adequate time to comment. CEQA also requires lead agencies to respond to comments on significant environmental points and adjust the Final EIR in response to public</p>

A Comparison of IFC Performance Standard 1 and the California Environmental Quality Act

	<p>notice shall be published in the newspaper of largest circulation from among the newspapers of general circulation in those areas.</p> <p>(2) Posting of notice by the public agency on and off the site in the area where the project is to be located.</p> <p>(3) Direct mailing to the owners and occupants of property contiguous to the parcel or parcels on which the project is located. Owners of such property shall be identified as shown on the latest equalized assessment roll.</p> <p>15203. ADEQUATE TIME FOR REVIEW AND COMMENT The Lead Agency shall provide adequate time for other public agencies and members of the public to review and comment on a draft EIR or Negative Declaration that it has prepared.</p> <p>(a) Public agencies may establish time periods for review in their implementing procedures and shall notify the public and reviewing agencies of the time for receipt of comments on EIRs. These time periods shall be consistent with applicable statutes, the State CEQA Guidelines, and applicable Clearinghouse review periods.</p> <p>15132. CONTENTS OF FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT The Final EIR shall consist of:</p> <p>(a) The draft EIR or a revision of the draft.</p> <p>(b) Comments and recommendations received on the draft EIR either verbatim or in summary.</p> <p>(c) A list of persons, organizations, and public agencies commenting on the draft EIR.</p> <p>(d) The responses of the Lead Agency to significant environmental points raised in the review and consultation process.</p> <p>(e) Any other information added by the Lead Agency.</p> <p>15097. MITIGATION MONITORING OR REPORTING. (e) At its discretion, an agency may adopt standardized policies and requirements to guide individually adopted monitoring or reporting programs. Standardized policies and requirements may describe, but are not limited to:</p>	<p>comment.</p>
--	---	-----------------

A Comparison of IFC Performance Standard 1 and the California Environmental Quality Act

	<p>(1) The relative responsibilities of various departments within the agency for various aspects of monitoring or reporting, including lead responsibility for administering typical programs and support responsibilities.</p> <p>(2) The responsibilities of the project proponent.</p> <p>(3) Agency guidelines for preparing monitoring or reporting programs.</p> <p>(4) General standards for determining project compliance with the mitigation measures or revisions and related conditions of approval.</p> <p>(5) Enforcement procedures for noncompliance, including provisions for administrative appeal.</p> <p>(6) Process for informing staff and decision makers of the relative success of mitigation measures and using those results to improve future mitigation measures.</p>	
<p>35. Where there are Affected Communities, the client will establish a grievance mechanism to receive and facilitate resolution of Affected Communities' concerns and grievances about the client's environmental and social performance. The grievance mechanism should be scaled to the risks and adverse impacts of the project and have Affected Communities as its primary user. It should seek to resolve concerns promptly, using an understandable and transparent consultative process that is culturally appropriate and readily accessible, and at no cost and without retribution to the party that originated the issue or concern. The mechanism should not impede access to judicial or administrative remedies. The client will inform the Affected Communities about the mechanism in the course of the stakeholder engagement process.</p>	<p>15097. MITIGATION MONITORING OR REPORTING.</p> <p>(e) At its discretion, an agency may adopt standardized policies and requirements to guide individually adopted monitoring or reporting programs. Standardized policies and requirements may describe, but are not limited to:</p> <p>(5) Enforcement procedures for noncompliance, including provisions for administrative appeal.</p>	<p>PS1 requires the project proponent to establish a grievance mechanism to resolve concerns about the proposed project's environmental and social performance. Grievance mechanisms are not required under CEQA. Members of the public with significant concerns concerning the level of environmental analysis present in the Draft EIR may submit a comment that must be addressed by the lead agency (see above); however, more complex grievances (or grievances occurring after the certification of the EIR) are not accommodated by the CEQA process.</p> <p>Depending on how mitigation monitoring and reporting requirements are written, there can be a provision for a grievance mechanism. In practice, however, this is rare. For projects in California with CEQA review, the Judicial Branch of California is typically the forum for grievances.</p>
<p>36. The client will provide periodic reports to the Affected Communities that describe progress with</p>	<p>15097. MITIGATION MONITORING OR REPORTING.</p> <p>(e) At its discretion, an agency may adopt standardized</p>	<p>PS1 requires the project proponent to provide periodic reports to potentially</p>

A Comparison of IFC Performance Standard 1 and the California Environmental Quality Act

implementation of the project Action Plans on issues that involve ongoing risk to or impacts on Affected Communities and on issues that the consultation process or grievance mechanism have identified as a concern to those Communities. If the management program results in material changes in or additions to the mitigation measures or actions described in the Action Plans on issues of concern to the Affected Communities, the updated relevant mitigation measures or actions will be communicated to them. The frequency of these reports will be proportionate to the concerns of Affected Communities but not less than annually.	policies and requirements to guide individually adopted monitoring or reporting programs. Standardized policies and requirements may describe, but are not limited to: (6) Process for informing staff and decision makers of the relative success of mitigation measures and using those results to improve future mitigation measures.	affected populations over the course of the project lifespan on topics of concern to those populations. Mitigation monitoring and reporting guidance under CEQA is not as specific as PS1. However, CEQA provides ample flexibility for project proponents to develop mitigation monitoring and reporting programs that include progress reports and continued involvement of adversely affected stakeholder groups.
---	---	---

Annex 6 – Draft Initial Screening Tool and Condition Assessment Report

The rest of this page is left intentionally blank.

Environmental and Social Impact Assessment Screening Tool

MCA-Georgia provided a screening tool and assessment report template for use in evaluating the sites where construction/renovation activities will be conducted. This template appears on the following pages. This tool will be used for assessment of the environmental and social risk factors associated with each of these sites. Completed documents will be provided for each site where renovation and construction activities are to be conducted during the pre-enrollment period and the enrollment period along with the relevant construction and renovation documents.

A comprehensive condition assessment report will be compiled from the completed screening tools which will summarize the issues identified (if any) across all sites. The completed tools will be provided as backup to this report.

Environmental and Social Risk Screening tool is developed to ensure early assessment of the environmental and social situation regarding the site that is being rehabilitating under the Compact. It screens the facility and provides the necessary information for developing respective addressing and management mechanisms to mitigate those risks identified and integrate environmental and social aspects in project development and implementation. It is based on the outcomes of condition assessment and provides summary details to assess initial potential risks and determine whether the particular potential component is eligible for the project. The screening tool is summarizing the outcomes of the condition assessment review and field survey providing initial assessment of potential environmental and social risks.

Potential risks revealed during the condition assessment and through application of this screening tool will also facilitate identification of the key stakeholders that could potentially be affected by the project and will need to be consulted throughout the project implementation. These potential risks will serve as a basis to identify potential impacts and elaborate adequate mitigation measures to be included in the Environmental and Social Management Plan.

General information	
Project Title:	
Date of assessment	
Name of Educational Institution:	
Location (Region/District):	
Code/Address of Educational Institution:	
The Property Area: in square meters (m ²)	
Legal Ownership/Land Titling:	
Construction or rehabilitation area:	
Site Plan (Note: please, refer the areas to be rehabilitated/constructed, both indoor and outdoor).	
Is there any person in the educational institution responsible for environmental and social issues?	
Name of the person conducting the assessment:	

Questions (Please elaborate answers in full details in the "Remarks" column)	Yes	No	Remarks
A. Project Siting			
Is the Project area adjacent to or within any of the following environmentally sensitive areas?			
• Densely populated areas			
• Areas with heavy development activities			
• Historical and/or cultural heritage site			
• Protected area			
• Buffer zone of protected area			
• Very steep slope			
• Wetland			
• Estuarine			
• Forest			
B. Potential Environmental Impacts			
Will the Project cause:			
• Deterioration of surface water quality due to runoff, wastes from construction camps and chemicals used in construction?			
• Deterioration of surrounding environmental conditions due to increased waste generation?			
• Increased local air pollution due to rock crushing, cutting and filling?			
• Encroachment on precious ecosystem (e.g. sensitive or protected areas)?			

Questions (Please elaborate answers in full details in the “Remarks” column)	Yes	No	Remarks
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alteration of surface water hydrology of waterways resulting in increased sediment in streams affected by increased soil erosion at the construction site? 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Damage to sensitive habitats as a result of construction activities? 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chemical pollution resulting from chemical clearing of vegetation for construction site or use of chemicals during implementation of works? 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noise and vibration due to blasting and other civil works? 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Creation of temporary breeding habitats for vectors of disease such as mosquitoes and rodents? 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hazardous waste and materials present on site and to be disturbed during the works? 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Encroachment on historical and or cultural areas? 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disfiguration or defragmentation of landscape 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the Project area subject to natural hazards such as earthquakes, floods, landslides, etc.? 			
C. Health and Safety Impacts Will the Project cause:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Risks and vulnerabilities related to occupational health and safety due to physical, chemical, biological, hazards (lead based paints, asbestos, PCP, bitumen) during project construction, rehabilitation and/or operation? 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poor sanitation and solid waste disposal in construction camps and work sites, and possible transmission of communicable diseases from workers to local populations? 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Risks to community (teachers, students, user of school facilities, representatives of local community) safety associated with maintenance of project related facilities? 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Risks to community (teachers, students, user of school facilities, representatives of local community) health and safety due to the transport, storage, and use and/or disposal of materials such as explosives, fuel and other chemicals (asbestos, lead, etc.) during construction and/or operation? 			

Questions (Please elaborate answers in full details in the “Remarks” column)	Yes	No	Remarks
D. Labour Impacts			
Will the Project cause:			
• Changes in employment level?			
• Workers influx during project implementation?			
• Social conflicts if workers from other regions or countries are hired?			
E. Social and Gender Impacts			
Will the Project cause:			
• Disproportionate impacts on the poor, women and children, or other vulnerable groups?			
• Difficulties related to access for the vulnerable persons (including students and teachers with special needs)			
• Inconvenience related to inclusive sanitation and privacy?			
• Adverse impacts on ethnic minority groups? (Provide details on ethnic composition of the students, when applicable)			
• Adverse impacts on marginalized groups?			
• Large population influx during project implementation?			
• Social conflicts relating to inconveniences in living conditions during construction?			
F. Land Use and Resettlement Impacts			
Will the Project cause:			
• Dislocation or involuntary resettlement of people or businesses due to rehabilitation or construction activities?			
• Private land be acquired or purchased? (for example for utility connections and/or hook ups)			
• Loss of shelter and residential land by land owner?			
• Temporary dislocation of shelter and/or residential land by land owner?			
• Loss of shelter or business operated by non-titled users of land?			
• Temporary dislocation of shelter and/or residential land by non-titled user of land?			
• Loss of shelter and/or business, by land owner?			
• Temporary dislocation of shelter and/or business, by land owner?			

Questions (Please elaborate answers in full details in the “Remarks” column)	Yes	No	Remarks
• Loss of shelter and/or business, by non-titled user of land (teachers, professors. etc)?			
• Temporary dislocation of shelter and/or business, by non-titled user of land?			
• Loss of shelter and/or business, when renting space?			
• Temporary dislocation of shelter and/or business, when renting space?			

Annex 7 – Draft Agreement with Partner Institutions (TSU agreement supplied as reference terms for all partner institutions)

The rest of this page is left intentionally blank.

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

BY AND BETWEEN

SAN DIEGO STATE UNIVERSITY

SAN DIEGO STATE UNIVERSITY RESEARCH FOUNDATION

San Diego, CALIFORNIA

AND

**IVANE JVAKHISHVILI TBILISI UNIVERSITY (AS EXAMPLE, APPROPRIATE
PARTNER NAME WILL GO HERE, AND AT OTHER LOCATIONS WITHIN THE
DOCUMENT)**

Tbilisi, GEORGIA

This Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) is entered into and effective this __ day of _____, 2014 between San Diego State University (SDSU) on behalf of the Board of Trustees of the California State University, San Diego State University Research Foundation (SDSURF), and Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University (TSU).

Considering That:

The Government of Georgia (the “Government”) and the United States of America, acting through the Millennium Challenge Corporation (“MCC”) entered into a five year Millennium Challenge Compact on July 26, 2013, providing for a grant of up to \$140,000,000USD to advance economic growth and reduce poverty in Georgia (the “Compact”). The Government has established LEPL MCA-Georgia (MCA-Georgia) to act as its designee to oversee and manage the implementation of the Compact in Georgia.

MCA-Georgia concluded an agreement of cooperation with SDSU on July 28, 2014 for the provision of Degree Accreditation and Institutional Support Initiative for Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics by SDSU in Georgia with initial, five year funding.

In furtherance of the July 28, 2014 agreement of cooperation, SDSU, SDSURF and TSU wish to collaborate in the Degree Accreditation and Institutional Support Initiative for Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (**SDSU-Georgia) Program (DAISI)**. SDSU, SDSURF and TSU declare readiness to partner for strengthening the quality of higher education in Georgia and to establish and develop U.S. Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (STEM) bachelor degree programs in recognition of the importance of quality of higher education to ensure further economic growth of Georgia.

Article I. FRAMEWORK

- a) SDSU submitted a proposal and has been awarded a contract from MCA-Georgia for “Georgia-SDSU: Degree Accreditation and Institutional Support Initiative for Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics”. The contract provides for performance of the initial 15 month period of the proposal from July 28, 2014 through October 27, 2015. This 15 month period shall be referred to as the “Pre-Enrollment”

Period. Prior to the expiration of the contract, the SDSU and MCA-Georgia intend to enter into a contract addressing the performance for the remaining 45 month period. This subsequent 45 month period shall be referred to as the “Enrollment Period;” and

- b) SDSU is an accredited campus of the California State University; the California State University being the State of California acting in its higher education capacity; and
- c) SDSU is one of the 23 universities of the California State University System. Operating under the authority of Title 5 of the California Administrative Code. The President of the campus may initiate agreements with foreign institutions of higher education to further the university’s missions of education, research and service to the global community.
- d) SDSURF has been vested with authority to perform the functions specified in 42500, Title 5, California Code of Regulations, including assisting faculty and staff in developing and administering third-party-funded sponsored programs, subject to the concurrence of SDSU that the activity is supportive of and consistent with the academic mission and conducted solely for the benefit of the University; and
- e) SDSU designates and will sub-contract with SDSURF to receive and apply the funds and properties coming into its possession toward furthering these purposes only for the benefit of SDSU; and
- f) TSU is empowered by its bylaws to enter into cooperative agreements of this nature with other universities in regard to the subject related to the achievement of its goals and objectives as stated in its bylaws, in order to further contribute to the achievement of such goals and objectives
- g) TSU represents and warrants that it is an educational entity in good standing in the country of Georgia; has the legal authority to enter into this MOU; and has obtained all necessary approvals and rights required by applicable laws, rules and regulations necessary to enter into, and perform under, this MOU.

Article II. PURPOSE AND SCOPE

SDSU, SDSURF and TSU commit to cooperatively develop programs that will provide US-accredited higher education focused on the needs of Georgia in the STEM, and other related disciplines.

It is recognized that the ability of SDSU, SDSURF and TSU to perform any cooperative obligations requires that the participating parties budget, monitor and control their own expenditures. Each signatory to this MOU is responsible for its own work and expenses.

Article III. RESPONSIBILITIES

The parties’ responsibilities under this MOU are in furtherance of and based upon the framework set forth in the July 28, 2014 agreement between SDSU and MCA-Georgia.

The responsibilities described below are illustrative. It is anticipated that the parties will enter into an agreement setting forth the parties’ obligations in greater detail.

Section 3.01 SPACE

SDSU and/or SDSURF will provide administrative support for the program, to be housed at a location yet to be finalized at TSU. In addition, SDSU and/or SDSURF will hire appropriate personnel as determined by SDSU, to assist in representing the program at TSU. TSU will assist with advertising

the availability of such positions within its human resources channels. TSU will provide space for SDSU's and SDSURF's administrative units for such time period as is needed.

TSU will also provide space for lecture halls, laboratories, smart computer classrooms, and such other space as is needed to administer and provide the STEM programs.

TSU will authorize SDSU to plan, renovate, and operate the program at TSU. Spaces are to be made available for renovation to SDSU on a priority/exclusive basis. Any renovations shall be constructed in conformity with schematic plans provided by SDSU and approved by TSU, and in conformity with MCA-Georgia Environmental Regulations. TSU acknowledges the value the project offers to TSU. SDSU shall arrange for the design, renovation, and construction necessary for the program, including all attendant facilities, in substantial accordance with the contract documentation approved (or to be approved) by MCA-Georgia and consistent with the requirements of MCA-Georgia and TSU.

SDSU will have priority for scheduling of the spaces once the renovations are complete. Access to these spaces will be under the control of SDSU pursuant to the objectives of the program and in compliance with Environmental, Social, and Management Plans (ESMPs) developed for the renovation and operation phases. TSU will cooperate in obtaining samples or data as needed for the completion of ESMP documents for the renovation and construction phases.

A separate Facilities Sharing Agreement will be negotiated between SDSU and TSU to stipulate details associated with the size, number and types of rooms, sharing arrangements and remuneration for students taking courses across institutions. TSU agrees that any facilities provided within the scope of this MOU will be fully maintained and furnished with all utilities and operational services necessary for occupancy and computer operations, including insurance, building maintenance, security, janitorial, administrative, and legal and accounting expenses related to property management. The cost of these services will be borne by TSU.

Section 3.02 ACCREDITATION SUPPORT

The accreditation processes in Georgia and with US-based accreditors are critical to the goals of this project. Georgian accreditation is necessary to allow students to enroll in those programs, and necessary documents must be submitted in the Fall of 2014. SDSU and TSU will make all respective efforts to ensure that accreditation deadlines are met to ensure the first enrollment of students in the SDSU programs in Georgia take place for the 2015-2016 academic year. SDSU will provide needed documents, including course syllabi, CV's, and descriptions of the programs, in Word format in English. TSU will assist with translation of these documents into Georgian, if required, and compiling the accreditation documents for submission. TSU will submit the final documents for accreditation of the programs to be conducted at TSU. US-based accreditation process will be initiated once the programs have started. TSU will provide documents as needed for such courses, facilities, and faculty as are needed for the programs, and will provide access and support for accreditation teams during site visits. SDSU will compile and submit all documents needed for the US-based accreditation.

Section 3.03 ARTICULATION

Articulation consists of the evaluation of courses offered at TSU for possible acceptance toward SDSU degree requirements for students who successfully complete the courses. SDSU and TSU will work together to identify courses offered to students at TSU for students to complete the requirements of the SDSU-Georgia degree programs. TSU will provide syllabi and quality assessment documentation for such courses to SDSU. SDSU will perform articulation analyses for such courses

as are submitted for evaluation, and will provide documentation of its articulation decisions in writing.

Section 3.04 ENGLISH/STEM INSTITUTE

It is intended that SDSU will offer an English institute, at facilities provided by TSU, to begin operations in the Fall of 2014, in order to prepare interested students for enrollment in Fall 2015. Space requirements will be further detailed in the Facilities Sharing Agreement.

Section 3.05 STUDENT RECRUITING

TSU will assist with recruiting students to the SDSU-Georgia program. SDSU will create marketing materials for the programs, with input from TSU. TSU will provide SDSU with a schedule of recruiting events and activities they expect to participate in over the course of the academic year, and assist SDSU in participating in such events. Particular efforts will be extended to identify opportunities that could provide outreach to socially vulnerable populations.

Section 3.06 FACULTY

TSU will support efforts to develop its faculty members to deliver and assess courses to the standards required by the relevant accrediting bodies. Such support will include:

- Faculty participation in sessions at SDSU. TSU will nominate faculty for participation in sessions hosted at SDSU during summer, fall, or spring semesters. TSU will verify that any nominated faculty are eligible for US visas and provide release time during the relevant period. TSU will make its faculty aware of such opportunities, and provide materials for the faculty to be evaluated. SDSU will select faculty for participation through evaluation of their CV's and interviews with the SDSU-Georgia Dean.
- Faculty participation in delivery of courses – TSU will assign faculty, preferably faculty who have participated in sessions at SDSU, to STEM courses offered in the Program. Faculty participation will also include synchronous online sessions to address questions raised by students in the Georgian classroom, and office hours for SDSU-Georgia students.
- Faculty delivery of courses – TSU will assign faculty to teach in the SDSU-Georgia program once they have sufficient understanding of the delivery and assessment methods, and the specific course learning outcomes. SDSU will assign faculty to provide advice, assistance, and mentorship to such faculty.

In recognition of their contributions, TSU and SDSU may appoint faculty from the other institution to adjunct positions.

Section 3.07 RESTRICTED ACTIONS

TSU recognizes and acknowledges that it shall not:

- a. Represent itself as an SDSU or SDSURF entity, partner, agent or representative.
- b. Suggest to prospective students or students that they can come to the United States on a student visa with a primary purpose other than full-time study.
- c. Make any false or misleading comparisons (or claims of association) between SDSU and any other educational institution.
- d. Make any representation that SDSU or SDSURF is or is not associated with any other educational institution.
- e. Facilitate applications for prospective students who do not satisfy or comply with SDSU admission requirements.
- f. Offer any guarantees to prospective students or students about uncertainties such as whether they will be granted a student visa; whether they will be admitted to the Program; or the likelihood of obtaining financial aid or scholarships.
- g. Give to any third parties, including but not limited to students or prospective students, any promotional or other Program-related information that has not been pre-approved in writing by SDSU.
- h. Commit SDSU to accept any prospective student or student into the Program.
- i. Undertake any advertising or promotional activity (including distributing or otherwise publishing any materials) about SDSU or the Program without SDSU's prior written consent.
- j. Use any registered or unregistered California State University or SDSU Marks without prior written authorization from SDSU. "Marks" means logos, trademarks, service marks, designs, and other intellectual property that belong to, are owned by, are licensed to, or carry the name of SDSU and/or the California State University, or any other name protected by California Education Code section 89005.5, whether registered or not registered.

Nothing contained in this Agreement shall be construed as conferring on TSU, any right to use SDSU or SDSURF's name as an endorsement of any product or service or to advertise, promote or otherwise market any product or service without the prior written consent of SDSU. Furthermore, nothing in this Agreement shall be construed as an endorsement of any commercial product or service by SDSU, SDSURF, its officers, employees or agents.

Article IV. STUDENT STATUS

Students enrolled in the SDSU-Georgia program will be SDSU students and, as such, any disciplinary procedures will fall under the SDSU Student Conduct Code as described in Section 41301 of Title 5, California Code of Regulations. SDSU is committed to maintaining a safe and healthy learning environment for students, faculty, and staff. Each member of the campus community should choose behaviors that reflect these standards. Students are expected to be good citizens and to engage in responsible behaviors that reflect well upon their university, to be civil to one another and to others in the campus community, and contribute positively to student and university life. Disciplinary procedures will be conducted in compliance with California State University policy.

Article V. ADVISORY BOARD PARTICIPATION

Of critical importance is the establishment and recognition of the Board of Advisors – a collaborative advisory group with representation from the major partners and important industry and research stakeholders in Georgia. The Board of Advisors will guide the long-term strategic development of the program and will form the cornerstone of a collaborative process to negotiate resolutions that meet the needs and objectives of all the partner institutions. TSU will make available the Rector, or such individual as the Rector may designate, to serve on the Board of Advisors.

Article VI. COMMENCEMENT AND DURATION

This MOU shall commence on the date of its signature and shall remain in force for 5 years, subject to renewal at intervals of no more than 5 years, and up to 20 years total.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF the undersigned, being duly authorized to do so, have signed this Memorandum of Understanding.

FOR SAN DIEGO STATE UNIVERSITY

FOR IVANE JVAKHISHVILI TBILISI
UNIVERSITY

FOR SAN DIEGO STATE UNIVERSITY
RESEARCH FOUNDATION
